

# The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1901.

## A R I S T O P H A N I C A . — II .

(Continued from p. 355.)

### K N I G H T S .

Why do English editors go on giving us characters called Demosthenes, Nicias and Cleon? There are no such people in the play at all, and it would greatly vex Aristophanes to see his satire so spoiled. From an editor with Dr. Merry's sense of humour the comic poet might have looked for better treatment, and now Messrs. Hall and Geldart in their new *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* text have done the same thing. The foreign editors are usually too skilful to make this mistake. Neither Kock, nor Von Velsen, nor Van Leeuwen falls into it, though Zacher does. Dr. Blaydes, too, in his monumental Aristophanes knows better. But the editions which in this country will be in every one's hands continue what I must take leave to call the absurd tradition. Cleon, Nicias, Demosthenes do not appear in the *Knights*. There are three slaves, two like those in the *Peace* without any distinctive names at all, the third named Paphlagon, which is as much a name as Syrus. They stand for the distinguished men in question, but the point of the whole thing is that it is a sort of humorous allegory or imaginative burlesque, and attaching the names of the real men to the three slaves dulls and blunts the humour in an unpardonable way. Paphlagon is not Cleon: he only holds towards his master

and his fellow slaves a relation burlesquing that of Cleon towards the people and the other prominent public men of Athens. We must not confound the caricature with the thing caricatured by putting the true names to the fancy picture. As well might Dryden in his great satire have written *Shafesbury* and *Shadwell* for Achitophel and Og.

15. [OIK. A] ἀλλ' εἰπὲ θαρρῶν, εἴτα κάγω σοι φράσω.  
OIK. B. πῶς ἀν σύ μοι λέξειας ἀμὲ χρῆ λέγειν;  
OIK. A. ἀλλ' οὐδὲν μοι τὸ θρέτε. πῶς ἀν οὐδὲν ποτε εἴποιμ' ἀν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευριπίκως;  
OIK. B. μή μοι γε, μή μοι, μὴ διασκανδίκιος.

This is the order of the lines in all MSS. Recent editors, seeing that they are rather incoherent as they stand, have put 16 before 15, and it is certainly the case that 17 gains by following directly on 15. But what seems to me the true order of the five lines has not been suggested. Line 16, the quotation from Euripides, is the key to the difficulty. In 18 A asks how he can express himself in subtle Euripidean fashion. He then answers his own question by this quotation (16) πῶς ἀν κ.τ.λ. and it is this quotation which provokes from B the exclamations

mation of disgust, μή μοί γε κ.τ.λ., with the reference to the Euripidean manner in διασκανδικίσγεις. The lines will then run :

[ΟΙΚ. Α] ἀλλ' εἰπὲ θαρρῶν, εἴτα κάγω σοι φρόσων.

ΟΙΚ. Β. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔνι μοι τὸ θρέπτε. πῶς ἂν οὖν ποτε

εἴπουμ' ἀν' αὐτὸν δῆτα κομψευριτικῶς;  
πῶς ἀν' σύ μοι λέξεις ἄμε

χρή λέγειν;

ΟΙΚ. Α. μή μοί γε, μή μοι, μὴ διασκανδικίσγεις.

If this transposition be adopted, some slight change must be made elsewhere, if we are not to alter the speakers through the rest of the scene. We might give 11 and 12 to Β and so proceed, or λέγε σύ in 13 might be given to Α, σὺ μὲν οὖν κ.τ.λ. to Β. For the transposition compare perhaps 258–265, where it seems best to put 264–5 after 260.

188 ἀλλ', ὥσθ', οὐδὲ μονοικήν ἐπίσταμαι πλὴν γραμμάτων, καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι κακὰ κακῶς.

Dr. Blaydes quotes the imitation in Procopius *Bell. Pers.* p. 70 c : οὐ γάρ ἀλλο οὐδὲν ἐς γραμματιστῶν φοιτῶν ἔμαθεν ὅτι μὴ γράμματα, καὶ ταῦτα κακὰ κακῶς, γράψαι. Has he noticed that Gibbon in a note to his fortieth chapter has quoted the historian's description of John of Cappadocia, adding the comment 'a forcible expression'? Apparently Gibbon did not remember that the words were a quotation from Aristophanes, and his editors, as far as I know, have not pointed it out.

598 ἀλλὰ τὰν τῇ γῇ μὲν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἄγαν θαυμάζομεν,  
ὡς ὅτ' εἰς τὰς ἵππαγωγὸνς εἰσεπήδων ἀνδρικῶς.

This very imperfect sentence should not have been left so long uncorrected. Herwden, indeed, has proposed for οὐκ ἄγαν to write οὐ τόσον, but Attic prose and comedy do not use τόσον for τοσοῖτος or τούς for τοιοῦτος. It is curious that the μέν of 598 has not suggested to any one the true correction, ὡς<δ> ὅτ', for it points to it very clearly. Compare a few sentences of more or less similar form :

Ach. 654 καὶ τῆς νήσου μὲν ἐκείνης  
οὐ φροντίζουσ', ἀλλ' ἵνα τοῦτον τὸν  
ποιητὴν ἀφέλωνται.

Wasps 482 ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν οὐδὲν ἀλγεῖς, ἀλλ' ὅταν κ.τ.λ.

Plato *Lysis* 204 δ καὶ ἀ μὲν καταλογάδην δημέται δεινὰ ὄντα οὐ πάντα τι δεινά ἔστων, ἀλλ' ἐπειδάν τὰ ποιήματα ἡμῶν ἐπιχειρήσηγ κιτατλεῖν.

Ar. *Eth.* 4. 7. 1127 b 12 εἰ δ' ἔνεκά ταύτος, ὁ μὲν δόξης ἡ τιμῆς οὐ λίαν φεκτός... ὁ δὲ ἀργυρίον . . ἀσχημονέστερος, though not elliptic in construction, is worth citing for the οὐ λίαν.

1385 ἔχειν ἐπὶ τούτοις τοντονὶ τὸν ὄκλαδίαν καὶ πᾶν ἐνόρχην ὕσπερ οὔσει τόνδε σοι.

I ventured to say in vol. xi. p. 19 of this *Review* that ὕσπερ could not be used thus for οὔσις or ὄσ. I ought to have seen then what is very obvious on a little thought, that Aristophanes wrote ὃς περιούσει. So in 727 of this play Elmsley corrected the unmetrical οὔστερ ὑβρίζομαι το ὅντα περιβρίζομαι, and in Lucian *Eunuchus* 7 the MSS. vary between ἕσπερ ἦν and εἰ περιῆν.

#### CLOUDS.

145 ἀνήρετ' ἄρτι Χαιρεφῶντα Σωκράτης ψύλλαν ὄπόστους ἀλλοιτο τοὺς αὐτῆς πόδας· δακοῦστα γὰρ τὸν Χαιρεφῶντος τὴν ὄφριν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τὴν Σωκράτους ἀφήλατο.

All the editors seem to give ἀλλοιτο. Both R and V however, with other MSS., are said to have ἀλλοιτο, and that (or perhaps ἀλλαιτο) must be right. The question is not a general one, how far fleas jumped. 148 shows that it refers to the particular flea by which Chaerophon was bitten : δακοῦστα γάρ κ.τ.λ. is inconsistent with anything else. The question of Socrates therefore (if it was not rather Chaerophon's, as Piccolomini thinks, reading Χαιρεφῶν τὸν Σωκράτην) was, how far a flea had jumped. So apparently the scholiast took it, who wrote in his note ὄπόστους (πόδας) πηδήσειε.

1366 ἐγὼ γὰρ Αἰγαχύλον νομίζω πρῶτον ἐν ποιηταῖς  
ψόφον πλέων, ἀξέντατον, στόμφακα,  
κρημνοποιόν;

There should be no doubt that these two verses are a *question*, indignantly uttered by Pheidippides. In a *statement* made by Strepsiades the second line could hardly pass as a stroke of humour, but there is no need to have recourse to transposing 1365 and 1366 with Hermann, Kock and Thompson. To the precisely similar questions of indignant surprise quoted by Blaydes (*Vesp.* 1159 : *An.* 815) add the following : *Vesp.* 1188 ἐγὼ δὲ τεθέωρηκα πώποτε ; οὐδαμοί (for so it should be written) : Soph. *Aj.* 1130 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀνψέξαμι δαμόνων νόμους ; Plat. *Rep.* 344 Ε ἐγὼ γάρ οἶμαι, ἔφη ὁ Θρασύμαχος, τοντὶ ἀλλος ἔχειν ; *Euthyd.* 297 Β ἀδελφὸς γάρ, ἔφη, ἐγὼ εἰμι Εἰνθόδημος ; Every one of these passages except *Vesp.* 1188 has a γάρ and every one

an emphatic ἐγώ. Probably the obscure passage in Xen. *Symp.* 4. 45 is to be explained in the same way.

1415 κλάουσι παιδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν  
δοκεῖ;

Many have been the suggestions for adding on three syllables at the end to make this a tetrameter. I think the addition quite necessary, but I would not add anything like Cobet's σὺ χρῆναι or Herwerden's προσήκειν. Though some such word as χρῆναι seems logically necessary, the poet might venture to dispense with it under the circumstances; the parody is more perfect without it. Suggestions are rather idle, but I will contribute mine—*ἴσως δὲ* or *ἴσως οὖν*, going with the next verse, φύσεις κ.τ.λ.

## WASPS.

967 ὁ δαιμόνι, ἐλέει τοὺς ταλαιπωρυμένους.

Mr. Starkie in his admirable edition (1897) reads αἰδοῦ for the unmetrical ἐλέει. Perhaps I may put on record that I made the same suggestion to the Oxford Philological Society at a meeting on November 2, 1894. I should prefer to regard ἐλέει as a gloss on αἰδοῦ and not as a corruption of it. With αἰδοῦ the line reminds us to some extent of *Nub.* 1468 *vai, vai, καταδέσθητι πατρῷον Δία*, in which the last three words are of course borrowed from tragedy. There is a certain mock solemnity about both. For this use of αἰδεῖσθαι may be compared such passages as *Od.* 3. 96 μηδέ τι μ' αἰδόμενος μειλίσσοι μηδὲ ἐλειρών: Eur. *Med.* 326: *Hec.* 286: *I.A.* 1246: *Antiphon* 1. 26 and 27.

## PEACE.

24 For ὥσπερ write ὥσπατερ, not with Blaydes ὥτιπερ. In Plat. *Rep.* 390 *v* I have suggested the alteration of ὥς to ὥστα, omitting ἃ.

83 μή μοι σοβαρῶς χώρει λίαν.

*σοβαρός* is much more likely. Such words are much preferred, especially in verse, in their adjectival form. So *Nub.* 406, φέρεται *σοβαρός*: *Plut.* 872, ὡς *σοβαρὸς...εἰσελήνιθεν*.

139 τοῦτοι τοῖς αἰτοῖσι τοῦτον χορτάσω.

It is such a fixed thing in Greek that ὁ αἰτός comes before, not after, οὗτος (*ταῦτα ταῦτα*, not *ταῦτα ταῦτά*, &c.) that perhaps we ought to find some way of altering this verse. We may think of τοῦτον γε τοῖς

αἰτοῖσι τοῦτοις χορτάσω, contrasting the beetle with Pegasus (135). [Dr. Postgate suggests τοῦτοις κούκ ἄλλοισι, comparing Soph. *O.C.* 908.]

180 πόθεν βροτοῦ με προσέβαλ'; ὄναξ  
Ἡράκλεις,  
τούτι τι ἔστι τὸ κακόν;

Write πόθεν βροτοῦ με προσέβαλ'; — ὄναξ, κ.τ.λ. Dr. Merry sees that the sentence is thus imperfect, not elliptical. Perhaps other editors see it too. If so, why not write it accordingly?

306 οὐ γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἀπειπεῖν ἀν δοκῶ μὲν τύμερον.

If this is really the text of the MSS. (Messrs. Hall and Geldart do not notice it), δοκῶμεν rather than Blaydes' δοκοῦμεν would seem the alternative to the δοκῶ μοι usually read.

479 ὅσοι γ' αἰτῶν ἔχονται τοῦ ξύλου.

If this refers to the prisoners from Sphaereteria, may not ἔχονται τῷ ξύλῳ be suggested? The loss of εῑ after ων might lead to the corruption of τῷ ξύλῳ.

729 ἀλλ' ίθι χαίρων ἡμεῖς δὲ τέως τάδε τὰ σκεύη παραδόντες  
τοῖς ἀκολούθοις δώμεν σώζειν.

Certainly δῶμεν and παραδόντες cannot be right together. Cobet approved (*N.L.* 51) of Hamaker's τάνδε σκευὴν ἀποδόντες, in which an article would surely be wanted. σκεύη is confirmed by 552, 886, 1318, and by τάτια in 732. Dr. Blaydes reads τάδε τὰ σκεύη καταθέντες, though it ought rather to be καταθέμενοι (886).

Since these are the first lines of a parabasis, the right word and the least possible change is παραβάντες. So immediately below in 735 αὐτὸν ἐπήγει τρὸν τὸ θέατρον παραβὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀναπαίστοις: *Eq.* 508 πρὸς τὸ θέατρον παραβῆναι: *Thesm.* 785 ἡμεῖς τοίνυν ἡμᾶς αὐτὰς εἰ̄ λέξωμεν παραβάσια: *Plato Comicus*, frag. 92 οὐκ ἀν παρέβην εἰ̄ λέξιν τούτῳ ἐπῶν. [Dr. Postgate suggests παποδόντες, cf. *Ach.* 627.]

## BIRDS.

79 τρόχιλος ὄρνις οὔτοσι.

I commented above on the mistake of calling Paphlagon Cleon. In its way it is equally a mistake and equally the spoiling of a joke, that this servant-bird (*ὄρνις δοῦλος* 70) should appear as a *dramatis persona* bearing the name of Τρόχιλος, just as his

master does that of "Εποψί. If he really were a trochilus, cannot the editors see that there would be no joke in saying of him here, τρόχιλος ὄρνις οὐτοσὶ? In the lines which precede he has been describing how he runs (*τρέχει*) for this or that thing, and so Euelpides says, 'why, he is a trochilus, this fellow.' The one thing then certain about him is that he was not recognised by the spectators as belonging to that kind. He may have been any bird in the world, real or imaginary, except a trochilus.

280 ΗΕΙ. τί τὸ τέρας τούτη πότ' ἔστιν; οὐ σὺ  
μάνος ἔφ' ἡσθ' ἐποψί,  
ἀλλὰ χοῦτος ἔτερος; ΕΠ. ἀλλ' οὐ  
τος μέν ἔστι Φιλοκλέους  
ἔξι ἔτοπος, ἐγώ δὲ τούτου πάππος,  
ώσπερ εἰ λέγους  
Ίππονικος Καλλίου καὶ Ίππονικον  
Καλλίας.

The editors find great difficulty in explaining *ἔξι ἔτοπος*. Some say 'son of Philocles' hoopoe,' others 'son of Philocles, the hoopoe's son.' In the second case 'the hoopoe' would be the speaker: in the first the alternation of generations (283) would be lost, since son, father, and grandfather, would be 'hoopoe' all three.

If *ἔψις* might, I think, make fair sense. He is asked, 'Is this another hoopoe?' and answers, 'Yes, he is one hoopoe, and I (whom you already know as hoopoe) am his grandfather. It is like Callias, etc.' The confusion of ΕΙC and ΕK is familiar (see above on *Ach.* 410). Cf. Cobet ad Dion. Hal. p. 182, who corrects *ἐκ δὲ τῶν* δημάρχων ..διάσταται to *εἰς δὲ τῶν δημάρχων*.

519 αὐτοί is obscure and awkward here. Perhaps *οὐτοί* or *αὐτοῦ*.

701 ἔνυμιγγυμένων δέ ἑτέρων ἑτέροις γένετ' οὐ-  
ρανὸς ὥκεανός τε.

The unaugmented *γένετ'* is absolutely unparalleled in Aristophanes and must be regarded with the very greatest suspicion. *γέγον'* is a correction which has found favour, though the tense is much against it. We might, however, compare Thuc. 1. 50. 2 ναυαγία αὐτῇ—μεγίστῃ δὴ τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτῆς γεγένηται : Plat. *Apol.* 28 c τῶν ἡμιθέων ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελετήκασι : Lycurg. 70 μόνοι δέ ἀμφοτέρων περιγέγόνασι : and γέγονα = the aorist is quite common in late Greek. The use being at least suspicious and the perfect here being only conjectural, perhaps another conjecture may be admitted, namely, that (ε)γένετ' was originally a gloss on some quite different word, e.g. ὥρτ' or φύετ' (φύεται :

there is no objection to the elision of such an *ai* in verbs).

753 εἰ μετ' ὄρνιθων τις ὑμῶν, ὃ θεαταί, βού-  
λεται  
διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν, ὡς ἡμᾶς  
ἴτω.

No one that I know of has demurred to this, but the sense is surely most unsatisfactory. We want 'If any one wishes for a pleasant life, let him join us birds,' not 'if any one wishes to lead a pleasant life with the birds, let him come to us.' In the first place, there are not various communities of birds, between which the Athenian yearning for a pleasant time might make his choice. The chorus are *the* birds, all the birds that are, and there is no other set of birds elsewhere for any one to join. The chorus are not comparing themselves advantageously with other feathered peoples. The things they say of themselves prove this, if proof were needed. Secondly, 'if any one wishes to join the birds' is not the thing to say. It is Aristophanes' own fancy that there is a bird-community and that men might join it with advantage. He must not put the case of people having formed the wish to join it independently of him and before he made the pleasant, wise suggestion. He can only have said 'if you want to enjoy yourselves, join the birds.' This being so, I do not see how *μετ' ὄρνιθων* can be right. It also strikes one that this is the only passage in Greek in which *διαπλέκειν* is used without an accusative. It occurs some half-dozen or more times, but always with some word like *βίον* (Herod. 5. 92 : *Laws* 806 A) or *ἡμέραν* (Aleman 16. 4). *τὸ λοιπόν* here is adverbial as usual—so L. and S. and the editors take it—and not the object of the verb: I doubt whether it is ever used except adverbially. We may say therefore that, while *μετ' ὄρνιθων* is not wanted, we do want an object for the verb.

Then we remember the line in the *Wasps*

1071 εἰ τις ὑμῶν, ὃ θεαταί, τὴν ἐμὴν ἴδων  
φύσιν,

and think that the line in the *Birds* may very well have run in the same way down to *θεαταί*; the missing words might come at the end. Finally we arrive at something like

εἰ τις ὑμῶν, ὃ θεαταί, βούλεται τὰς ἡμέρας  
διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν, ὡς ἡμᾶς ίτω.

Of course no one would venture to say that this is exactly what Aristophanes wrote. I

only submit that it makes good sense and that the vulgate does not.

## FROGS.

167 μὴ δῆθ', ίκετεώ σ', ἀλλὰ μίσθωσαί τινα  
τῶν ἐκφερομένων, ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται.

The last words are a great difficulty and have moved many scholars to think that the whole line should be omitted. To my mind that is not at all the way to deal with it. The fault is not in *τοῦτ'*, however, but in *ἔρχεται*. Xanthias is proposing that instead of himself one of the dead men taken out to burial shall be hired to carry the luggage. 'Hire' he says 'a dead man, who (or any one who) —for this.' What is the blank? Something like *will serve, will do*, i.e. *ἀρκέσει*. It is not every corpse that is competent. They must have a stout stalwart corpse for their purpose. Cf. Plat. *Rep.* 369 D, πῶς ἡ πόλις ἀρκέσει ἐπὶ τοσαντην παρασκενή; *Theat.* 174 Α ταῦτον δὲ ἀρκεῖ σκῶμα ἐπὶ πάντας: Xen. *Mem.* 2. 6 30 εἰ ἔξαρκέσει μοι ἡ αὐτῇ ἐπιστήμη ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγαθον κ.τ.λ. : *Oecon.* 12. 4 ὅστις μέλλει ἀρκέσειν...ἄντ' ἐμοὶ ἐπιμελούμενος, τί αὐτὸν καὶ δεῖ ἀλλο ἐπιστασθαι ἡ ἀπέρ ἐγώ; *Cygor.* 6. 2. 34 τὸ ἐφ' ἡμέραν ἀρκέσον and *ib.* 31 ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀρκεῖ. For the future cf. e.g. 98 of this play, ωδὴ γόνιμον ὅστις φθέγξεται κ.τ.λ.

The change of *a* to *e* and *κ* to *χ* is not difficult. Thus on Lucian *De Column.* 2 Cobet remarks (*V.L.* 286) *libri confundunt ἄρχεται et ἔρχεται per vulgato errore*, which he illustrates from the miswriting of *ἀρχομαι* with future participles in the place of *ἔρχομαι*, and he gives some examples of a different kind in *Misc. Crit.* 141. See also the *index Graecitatis* in Bast. p. 1042 A. In [Nen.] R.A. νομίζουσι τὸ δύτικὸν ἄρχειν is now corrected to *ἀρκεῖν*, and *Hell.* 3. 5. 15 ἔχοντες ναυτικὸν οὐχ ἕκονταν ἤρχετο το οὐκ ἔκοντων. In 1099 of this play *ἔρχεται* is by no means certainly right.

301 ιθ' γπερ ἔρχει. δεῦρο δεῦρ', ω δέσποτα.

It seems to have escaped notice that *ιθ'* *γπερ* *ἔρχει* is not addressed to Dionysus (nor spoken by him to Xanthias, as Van Leeuwen gives it) but to the imaginary goblin Eupusa, with whom the slave is terrifying his master. This appears clearly from the parallel passage *Lysistr.* 833.

Ω πότνια Κύπρον καὶ Κυθήρων καὶ Πάρον  
μεδέοντ', ιθ' ὄρθηγν γπερ ἔρχει τὴν οὖδον.

369 τούτοις αὐδῷ καῦθις ἀπανδῷ καῦθις τὸ  
τρίτον μάλ' ἀπανδῷ  
ἔξιστασθαι μύστασι χοροῖς.

*τούτοις αὐδῷ* V and the text of Aulus Gellius: *τούτοις ἀπανδῷ* R and most MSS. Two things are clear: (1) *αὐδῷ* and *ἀπανδῷ* cannot be combined in one and the same sense: (2) *ἀπανδῷ forbid* is quite out of place. It is ludicrous to suppose that *ἀπανδῷ* *ἔξιστασθαι* is a confused expression for *ἀπανδῷ* (*μή*) *ἐμποδὸν έναν*. I cannot see any plausibility in *τρωνδῷ* (*ter*) read by Blaydes and after him by Van Leeuwen. The true reading really stares one in the face:

τούτοις αὐδῷ καῦθις ἐπανδῷ καῦθις τὸ τρίτον μάλ'  
ἐπανδῷ.

*ἐπανδῷ tell again* does not happen to occur elsewhere, but that is quite immaterial. *ἀντανδῷ* seems to occur only in Soph. *El.* 1478 : *κατανδῷ* only in *Ant.* 86 ; *συνανδῷ* only in *Ag.* 943 and once in Theophrastus. *ἐπί* and *ἀπό* are quite easily confused in compounds: thus in Thuc. 5. 50. 1 *ἀπομόσαι* must be corrected to *ἐπομόσαι* (Stahl).

456 ὅσοι μεμνήμεθ' εὐ-  
σεβῆ τε δύγομεν  
τρόπον κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps *ὅσοι μεμνήμεθ'*, had been initiated and then went on living (δύγομεν).

467 ὁς τὸν κύν' ἡμῶν ἔξελάσας τὸν Κέρβερον  
ἀπῆξας ἄγχων κάποιορὰς ϕόνον λαβόν.

He did not *drive* Cerberus out; he *dragged* him out. Should we change *ἔξελάσας* to *ἔλκνας*?

553 καὶ κρέα γε πρὸς τούτοισι ἀνάβραστ'  
εἴκοσιν  
ἀνημιωβολιαῖα.

So apparently the best MSS. with others; some, however, *αὐ*' *ἡμιωβολιαῖα*, and in this form Pollux quotes it 9. 64, if Bekker's text may be trusted. Both seem impossible. 'At half an obol apiece' is either *ἡμιωβολιαῖα* or *αὐ*' *ἡμιωβόλιον*. Van Leeuwen *πάνθ'* for *αὐ*'. Did Aristophanes write *εἴκοσιν ἐν* *ἡμιωβολιαῖα* with a comic exactitude as to the number? cf. 49

καὶ κατεδύσαμέν γε ναῦς  
τῶν πολεμίων η δώδεκ' η τρέις καὶ δέκα.  
and 1129 τούτων ἔχειν ψύγεις τι;  
ΕΥ. πλέιν η δώδεκα.

814 foll. In the four stanzas here beginning, and too long to quote, I cannot doubt

that Dobree was right in thinking that 822–825 should follow on 817. *φρίξας δ' αὐτοκάμου κ.τ.λ.* is strictly continuous with *ὅμιλα στροβύσσεται*. It is most awkward for 818–821 to come between the two passages in which Aeschylus is described, and it much obscures the subject of *φρίξας κ.τ.λ.* But I think Dobree was wrong for once in putting 818–821 after 825. They should stand at the very end after 829. First come lines (814–817, 822–825) which depict Aeschylus bearing himself in the fray like a Titan or a mighty beast of the forest: then a stanza (826–829) setting forth the deft and subtle art of Euripides: finally one (818–821) which gives the conflict and the contrast of the two. In 826 read *ἔνθεν δέ on the other side*, not *ἔνθεν δύ*.

905 ἀλλ' ὡς τάχιστα χρὴ λέγειν οὐτω δ' ὅπως  
ἐρεῖτον  
ἀστεῖα καὶ μῆτ' εἰκόνας μῆθ' οἵτινες  
εἴποι.

No edition that I have looked at explains *εἰκόνας* properly. Thus Kock *Der Chorführer verlangt dasz sie unverblümt die Wahrheit sagen*: Blaydes *imagines, similitudines. Quibus indulget Aeschylus multo frequentius quam Euripides*: Merry *ἀστεῖα* implies 'smartness' and 'neatness'; either of which would be lost by the use of metaphor (*εἰκόνες*) or commonplace. But any one who remembers what Aristotle says with truth about metaphors (*Poetics* 22. 1459 a 7), that a good use of them is a mark of fine natural parts (*εὐφύια*) and not a thing to be just taken from somebody else (*παρ' ἄλλον λαβεῖν*) must be surprised to find metaphors put side by side with things *οἷς ἀντί* *ἄλλος εἴροι*. Moreover the scene that follows is full of metaphorical expressions, e.g. 941 foll. The truth is *εἰκόνες* here are not *metaphors*, but *comparisons*. The reference is to the rude humour of comparing a man to so and so, usually something ridiculous. This seems to have been a rather favourite, if unmannerly, pleasantry at Athens. See for instance *Wasps* 1308

*εἰτ' αὐτὸν ὡς εἴδ' γῆκασεν Λυσίστρατος,  
‘εὔκαστος, ὃ πρέσβυτος, νεοπλούτως τρυγὶ (Φρυγὶ  
Kock)  
κληρήρῳ τ' εἰς ἀχυρμόν ἀποδέδρακότι.’  
ὁ δὲ ἀνακραγὸν ἀντίκαστος αὐτὸν πάρνοπι  
τὰ θρῖα τοῦ τριβώνος ἀποβεβληκότι  
Σθενέλψ τε τὰ σκενάρια διακεκαρμένῳ.*

*Av. 804–7: Xen. Symp. 6. 8 σὺ μέντοι  
δεινὸς εἶ...εἰκάζειν...ἀλλ' ὅμως...σὺ αὐτὸν μὴ  
εἴκαζε: Plat. Meno 80 α the famous com-*

parison of Socrates to a torpedo-fish, followed by ΣΩ. γιγνώσκω οὖπερ ἔνεκά με γῆκαστ. MEN. τίνος δὴ οἵει; ΣΩ. ἵνα σε ἀντεικάσω. ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτο οἶδα περὶ πάντων τῶν καλῶν ὅτι χαίροντας εἰκάζομενοι: and Plat. *Symp.* 215 Λ the still more famous comparison of him to a silenus-image: Aristotle *De Gen. An.* 4. 3. 769 b 18 δὸς πολλάκις οἱ σκώπτοντες εἰκάζονται τῶν μὴ καλῶν ἐνίοις τοὺς μὲν αἰγὴ φυσῶνται πῦρ, τοὺς δὲ οὐ κυρίττοτι. What is meant in the *Frogs* therefore is that great men like Aeschylus and Euripides are not to indulge in these easy and often vulgar jokes at one another's expense. They are to contend in a way more worthy of their genius.

949 ἀλλ' ἔλεγεν ἡ γυνὴ τέ μοι χῶ δοῦλος οὐδὲν  
ἡττον  
χῶ δεσπότης χὴ παρθένος χὴ γραῦς ἀν.

I can never read these lines without wondering whether *χῶ δεσπότης* should not be *τοῦ δεσπότου*, or possibly *ἢ δεσπότης*. 'The master' has no business to come in third and on a level with the rest without even an *ἴτως* or an *ἔξ ἴτης* to carry it off. Also *οὐδὲν ἡττον* might stand if there were no *χῶ δεσπότης* there, but with those words surely it is very odd.

964 γνώσει δὲ τοὺς τούτους τε κάμοὺς ἐκατέρου  
μαθητᾶς.

Perhaps these words should be datives, *τοῖς...μαθητᾶς*. Cf. *Eccles.*

780 γνώσει δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν γε τῶν ἀγαλ-  
μάτων.

1180 ίθι δὴ λέγει· οὐ γάρ μονστὶν ἀλλ' ἀκουσ-  
τέα  
τῶν σῶν προλόγων τῆς ὁρθότητος τῶν  
ἐπών.

It had occurred to me whether ἀλλ' ἀκουστέα does not conceal ἀλλὰ γενοτέα. I should, however, hardly have mentioned this, if I had not subsequently noticed the mysterious scholium *γνῶναι πρὸ τοῦ ἀκούσαι. γνῶναι* points to some other reading.

1415 τὸν ἔπειρον λαβὼν ἀπει  
δόπτερον ἀν κρίνεις, ἢν' ἔλθης μὴ μάτην.

In 1163 Hirschig pointed out that ἔλθειν is a mistake for *ἥκειν*. The point of the whole passage there is the distinction of the synonyms *ἥκειν* and *κατέναι*, and this is lost if ἔλθειν is stupidly substituted for *ἥκειν* (*ἐ λ θ ε ἐν μὲν εἰς γῆν ἔσθ' ὅτε μετή πάτρας*). Here in 1416 is it not equally clear that the same error has occurred? The sense should be 'that you may not have come here for nothing,' and this is *οὐ' ἥκεις μὴ μάτην*. The

only possible meanings of *ν' ἀλθης* are (1) 'that you may come,' (2) 'that you may go.' The first would be unmeaning. As to the second, the sense of 'go' is comparatively uncommon, and indeed hardly possible where any ambiguity would ensue. Also *μάτην* can only apply to the coming, not to the going: 'that you may not go away for nothing' would be nonsense.

It may be pointed out on the one hand that MSS. sometimes vary between the corresponding parts of *ἡκω* and *ἡλθον*, e.g. Thuc. 1. 18. 2 *ἡλθε* and *ἥκε*: 8. 65. 1 *ἡλθον* and *ἥκον*: Xen. *Hell.* 1. 3. 11 the codices

*ἡλθεν*, the papyrus fragment *ἥκεν*: and on the other that in the scholia we find parts of *ἥκω* glossed by the corresponding parts of *ἥλθον*, which fact suggests how the latter may here and elsewhere have driven out the former. See for instance the scholia to the *Plutus* 357. 828. 841. 1179. 1190. 1201 and to the *Prometheus* 284. 299. They take such straightforward forms as *ἥκεις* : *ἥλθεις* (*Plut.* 357). Of course in Attic the two words are in most cases not really equivalent, but this the scholiasts did not know.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### ON PLATO, REPUBLIC X 616 E.

THE passage which I propose to discuss reads as follows:—

*Τὸν μὲν οὖν πρῶτὸν τε καὶ ἐξωτάτῳ σφόνδυλον πλανήτατον τὸν τοῦ χείλους κύκλον ἔχειν, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἕκτον δεύτερον, τρίτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ τετάρτου, τέταρτον δὲ τὸν δόγδον, πέμπτον δὲ τὸν δέσμον, ἕβδομον δὲ τὸν τοῦ τρίτου, ὅγδοον δὲ τὸν δέσμον, ἑντέρον δὲ τὸν δέσμον.*

The astronomical theory of which this sentence forms a part has been much discussed. The conclusions at which, after long study of the subject, I have arrived, and which I hope shortly to establish in my forthcoming edition of the *Republic*, are in general agreement with Boeckh and Zeller, as well as with the incidental remark—so far as it goes—dealing with this subject in Professor Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 203. Briefly stated, they are these. The *ἡλακάτη* is the axis of the Universe, and passes through the middle of the Earth, which is a motionless body occupying the centre of the Universe. The *πτοζώνα* is the Milky Way. Inside the whole are 7 concentric bowls, or as Plato calls them whorls, in the 'lips' or rims of which globes of fire are fixed, and these globes are the planets. The whorls are carried round from East to West every day together with the celestial sphere, but in order to account for the movements of the planets in their own orbits, Plato assigns to each of them also an independent motion on its own account from West to East. The order of the different circles is as follows, proceeding, as Plato does, from the outermost to the innermost:—

1. The Fixed Stars.
2. Saturn.
3. Jupiter.
4. Mars.
5. Mercury.
6. Venus.
7. The Sun.
8. The Moon.

So much for the general outline of the theory, which is as clearly conceived and lucid as Plato's theories always are. The particular difficulty with which this article deals concerns the breadth of the rims of the different whorls. What does Plato intend us to understand by the different breadths? On this question there is no agreement of opinion among those who have investigated the subject. Zeller, so far as I have noticed, does not touch upon the question, and I have not found anything satisfactory in Boeckh. It is difficult, or rather impossible, to understand how 'the breadth of the rings may be intended to signify the supposed distances of the orbits from each other' (Jowett and Campbell), or 'the surfaces traversed by the different Sirens,' (Donaldson in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* X 305–316), or 'interiecta inter aequatores et tropicos arcticos planetarum spatia' (Schleiermacher, quoted by Schneider. Cf. Schleiermacher's translation of the *Republic* 622 f.). Stallbaum says that Plato's meaning is here involved in 'Cimmerian darkness,' and even Schneider, who rarely evades a difficulty, complains that 'it is easier to say what the words cannot, than what they do, mean.' The simple

and natural explanation is that the breadth of the rims represents the size of the different planets. Each rim must of necessity be broad enough to contain the planet which resides in it, and no reason can be conceived why it should be any broader. That this is Plato's meaning will be seen if we look a little farther on. In the next sentence Plato writes: *καὶ τὸν μὲν τοῦ μεγίστου (the circle of the Fixed Stars) ποικίλον, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἐβδόμου (the circle of the Sun) λαμπρότατον, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ὕδοντος (the circle of the Moon) τὸ χρῶμα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἔχειν προσδάμποντος, τὸν δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου (the circle of Saturn) καὶ πέμπτου (the circle of Mercury) παραπλήσια ἀλλήλοις, ξανθότερα ἑκίνων, τρίτον δὲ τοῦ (the circle of Jupiter) λευκότατον χρῶμα ἔχειν, τέταρτον δὲ (the circle of Mars) ὑπέρυθρον, δεύτερον δὲ λευκότητι τὸν ἔκτον (the circle of Venus). Now what is *τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἐβδόμου* etc.? A glance at the previous sentence (quoted at the beginning of this article) shews that it is *τὸν ἐβδόμου (σφονδίλον)* *χείλον* κύκλον i.e. *the-circle-of-the-rim of the seventh whorl*. Similarly with the others. Now if the circle of the rim of the seventh whorl is brightest, if that of the eighth derives its colour from the seventh and so on, it follows, that since it is the *Sun* which is the brightest, the *Moon* which derives its light from the *Sun*, and so on—it follows, I say, that the 'circles of the rim,' in the case of the seven inner circles, are for all practical purposes identical with the planets fixed in the several circles. Hence the *breadth* of the rim must in each case denote the diameter of the planet and nothing else.*

This view was held by Theo Smyrnaeus (ed. Hiller p. 143. 14), and also, as we shall presently see, by other critics in antiquity, and is mentioned, though with disfavour, by some editors of the *Republic*. The only modern writer, so far as I know, who has insisted that this and nothing else is the meaning of Plato, is Schaubach in his *Griechische Astronomie* pp. 403–406, but Schaubach has unfortunately fallen into some serious errors in his explanation of the Greek. To me this interpretation appears to be necessitated by Plato's language, and we are therefore bound, I think, to accept it, to whatever conclusions it may lead as to the actual size, according to Plato, of the planetary bodies.

These conclusions are sufficiently startling, for according to the received text, we are invited by Plato to believe that the planets should be arranged as follows in the descending order of their size: *Venus,*

*Mars, Moon, Sun, Mercury, Jupiter, Saturn.* There is no evidence as to the views of the ancients on the size of the other planets, at all events so early as Plato's time, but we know that some of them were sensible enough to consider the *Sun* much larger than the *moon* (see Diels *Dox. Gr.* pp. 348, 355 and Hultsch in *Pauly-Wissowa art. Astronomie* pp. 1844 ff.), and it is very difficult to believe that anyone—even a man of science—could ever have imagined *Venus* to be bigger than the *Sun*!

Till the present year, it seemed to me likely that the matter would have to rest at this stage: for although Schaubach had suggested the possibility of corruption, the MSS shew no variants of any consequence,<sup>1</sup> and in the absence of external corroboration, it would have been rash to interfere with the text. But the complete publication by Kroll in 1901 of the hitherto unprinted part of Proclus' commentary on the *Republic* throws a new light upon the difficulty, and enables us to solve it, as I think, by means of emendation.

Proclus (I.c. ii. 218 1 ff.) informs us that there were two readings of this passage, the one *δευτέρα καὶ νεωτέρα, κρατοῦσα δὲ ἐν τοῖς κεκιωλισμένοις ἐν τι γράφει*, the other *προτέρα καὶ ἀρχαιοτέρα.* 'The second and newer reading' is that which appears in our MSS (see Proclus I.c. 219 ff.); the 'earlier and older' he thus describes. *καὶ η μὲν προτέρα καὶ ἀρχαιοτέρα (sc. γραφὴ τῆς λέξεως) τοῖς μεγέθεσιν ἀστρων κατεσπαρμένους κατὰ πᾶν αὐτὸν τὸ βάθος, ὃν ἔκαστοι ἀποδείκνυνται λόγος μείζονα τῆς γῆς—μετὰ τούτον δὲ οὖν τὸν ἀπλανῆ κύκλον πλατυτάτον ὄντα διὰ τὰ μεγέθη καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν ἀστρων οὐδὲ ἐπὶ μᾶλλον ἐπιφανείας ὄντων—τὸν τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τοῦ σφονδύλου τῶν λοιπῶν ἐβδομόν ὄντα τῷ πλάτει διαφέρειν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ ἥλιος τῶν φαινομένων φαίνεται μείζων. ἐπειτα <τὸν> σεληνιακοῦ (καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ πρὸς αἰσθησιν τῶν πέντε μείζων—), καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὸν τῆς Ἀρεοπόλεως (μείζων γὰρ καὶ αὐτῇ τῶν λοιπῶν φαίνεται), καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὸν τῆς Ἀρείου (καὶ γὰρ τὸν Ἀρεά φασιν ἐν τοῖς περιγείοις ὄντα μείζονα τοῦ Διὸς*

<sup>1</sup> The scribe in Vat. Θ omitted the word *ἔκτον* (not *ἔκτον*, as appears by a printer's error in Schneider) in *τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἔκτον δευτέρον*, probably, as Schneider remarks, because he (or his adviser) could not force himself to believe that Plato seriously thought *Venus* the largest of the planets.

ὅρᾶσθαι), καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς σφὸν δύλον καὶ ἔξης τὸν τοῦ Κρονίου, καὶ τελευτῶν εἶναι τὸν τοῦ Ἐρμαϊκοῦ· καὶ ἀπλός κατὰ τὰ μεγέθη τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ τὸν σφόνδυλον ἔχειν τὸ πλάτος (l.c. 218. 2-28). That is to say, according to the 'earlier and older reading,' the circles, in respect of breadth of rim, were as follows, if we arrange them as before in descending order; Fixed Stars, Sun, Moon, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn.

Compared with the former order, this is reason itself, whatever the man of science may say, and as it gets the relative sizes of the Sun and Moon right, it is in harmony with the opinions of most of the ancients before the time of Plato, so far as we know them. It would be a gratuitous insult to the memory of Proclus to suppose that the 'earlier and older' reading is an invention of Proclus' own, or a conjecture of some other equally unauthorised commentator, and his explanation of that reading is so full and

clear that it is easy to restore the προτέρα καὶ ἀρχαιοτέρα γραφή in the text of Plato.<sup>2</sup>

The reading of which Proclus speaks must have been τὸν μὲν οὐν πρῶτον τε καὶ ἔξωτάτῳ σφόνδυλον πλατύτατον τὸν τοῦ χειλούς κύκλον ἔχειν, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ἐβδόμον δεύτερον, τρίτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ διγόρον, τέταρτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ ἑκατοντα, πέμπτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ τετάρτου, ἕκτον δὲ τὸν τοῦ τρίτου, ἑβδόμον δὲ τὸν τοῦ διεντέρου, ὅγδοον δὲ τὸν τοῦ πέμπτου.

The bearing of this passage of Proclus on the question as to when and how our text of Plato was constituted, is a subject which I hope to discuss on a future occasion.

J. ADAM.

<sup>2</sup> On p. 414 of Proclus l.c. Kroll also suggests 'Ob uns Proklos mit der Lesart *a den echten Platotext aufbewahrt hat?* In *b* ist irgend welche ratio nicht zu erkennen und Proklos' Herumredereien zeigen, dass niemand mit dieser Reihenfolge etwas anzufangen vermocht hat.' Kroll does not attempt to restore the text of Plato, but could, of course, have done so, had he wished.

#### τὸν ἄνδρα 'MANHOOD,' AND THE SHAVING OF THE BEARD.

Polyb. iv. 5 ην δέ τις κατ' ἐκένους τοὺς καιροὺς ἀνθρώπος ἀσυρῆς ἐν τῇ Μεσσηρίῃ, τῶν ἔξηρμένων τὸν ἄνδρα κατὰ πάντα τρόπον, ὄνομα Βαβύρας, who closely resembled Dorimachus in appearance. ἀσυρῆς is 'filthy' or 'distracting' and means the same as ἀσελγῆς: but ἔξηρμένων is nothing; it cannot be what Stephanus (*s.v. ἀσυρές*) imagined, 'of such as had surpassed humanity,' 'significatur, insigni eum fuisse improbitate sive audacia, ita ut omnes homines ea superaret': nor can it be what Casaubon and Ernesti thought, 'of those who had exalted Dorimachus.' Schweighaeuser (*Index* p. 222) came near the truth in rendering it 'qui virilitatem prorsus omnibus modis exuerat,' adding 'sed fortasse ἔξηρμένων legendum.' ἔξηρμένων is the reading of two MSS., which Büttner-Wobst (p. xxiv in Teubner's edition) holds to be merely a conjecture: but it has also the authority of Cobet. I was curious to see what he would adduce in favour of it; and was not surprised to find that he had nothing: all he says is 'pro ἔξηρμένων nulla dubitatio est quin ἔξηρμένων sit emendandum.' But there is no support for such a phrase, and Hultsch and Büttner-Wobst were right in declining to admit it. The true reading is a little off the beaten track, but will not presently

be questioned: it is τῶν ἔξηρημένων τὸν ἄνδρα 'such as have denied their manhood.' This was a philosophical phrase (unknown to the Dictionaries) used by later moralists of ἄνδρογύνοι or κίναιδοι:

Clem. Alex. Pael. iii. 3 p. 264. 11 ὁ γὰρ ἵππος τὰς αὐγὰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἀρνούμενος<sup>1</sup> πρόσθρόλος ἐστι νίκτωρ ἐλεγχόμενος γυνῆ.

ib. p. 264. 37 παῖδες, ἀρνεῖσθαι<sup>1</sup> τὴν φύσιν δεδιδαγμένοις προσποιοῦται γυναικας.

Euseb. de vita Const. iii. 55 p. 217 Heinichen σχολή τις ἦν αὐτῆς κακοεργίας πάσιν ἀκολάστοις πολλῷ τε ῥαστῶν διεφθορόσι τὸ σῶμα· γύνιδες γοῦν τινες, ἄνδρες οὐκ ἄνδρες, τὸ σεμνόν τῆς φύσεως ἀπαρνησάμενοι, θηλείᾳ νόσῳ τὴν δαίμονα διεσύντο.

Firmicus de errore profan. relig. 4 dic mihi, hoccine est quod in viro seminam quaerunt, cui aliter servire sacerdotum suorum chorus non potest nisi effeminent vultum, cutem poliant, et virilem sexum ornatu muliereb[us] dedecorent . . . exornant mulierbriter nutritos crines, et delicatis amicti vestibus vix caput lassa cervice sustentant, deinde, cum sic se alienos a viris fecerint, . . . quod hoc monstrum est, quodque prodigium? negant se viros esse, et sunt; mulieres se

<sup>1</sup> Not in the *Thesaurus*.

*volunt credi, sed aliud qualiscumque qualitas corporis confiteretur.*

A.P. xi. 272 εἰς κιναῖδος :

ἀνέρας ἡρυγή σαντοι καὶ οὐκ ἐγένοντο γυναῖκες

Tertull. *de virgin. velandis* 12 facilius illa mulier negabitur quam ista virgo creditetur. 15 iam se etiam mulierem negat quae virginem celat.

The verb then I think we may consider settled, and may turn to this use of *τὸν ἄνδρα* with the article. It sounds like a Latinism, for in Latin the use of the substantive was familiar; e.g. Ov. *Met.* viii. 463 *pugnant materque sororque.* xii. 30 *reque patrem vicit.* xiii. 187. Seneca *Medea* 927 *ira decessit loco, materque tota coniuge expulsa redit. Thyest.* 937 *veterem ex animo mitte Thyesten. Stat. Theb.* xi. 659, 668. Claudian *Rapt. Pros.* iii. 104 *quod si non omnem pepulisti pectore matrem. De Bell. Gildon.* 397 *naturamque simul fratremque hominemque cruentus exiit. De III Cons. Honor.* 157 *indue mente patrem (your father). Sil. Ital.* vii. 495. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 52 *exueret magistrum (his master).* xvi. 28 *nisi proditionem palam et hostem induisset. Val. Max.* v. 8. *I exuit patrem ut consulem ageret.* Most of these are taken from Heinius and Burmann (II p. 435) on Ov. *Met.* vi. 629. It is from Latin that it came into modern language, ‘assumes the God,’ ‘the father softens, but the governor is firm.’ They used *virum* in the same way: Catull. 63. 6 (Ellis) *relicta sensit sibi membra sine viro. Arnob.* v. 39 *sibi Attis virum abstulit.* 13 *quid admirerat galus ut se viro privaret?* Lucan x. 133 *ferro mollita iuventus atque exsecta virum. Postgate* (*Silus Maniliana* p. 47 note) cites Prop. 4. 3. 59 *extimulare (et similare codd.) virum pretium facit, Manilius* 5. 151 *atque odisse virum sterilisque optare lacertos.* But in Greek,—which could use the adjective with the article, as *τὸν δοῦλον*,—it is far less freely used. This of Polybius is the earliest I find, unless the philosopher Pyrrho actually used the phrase put into his mouth by Diog. Laert. ix. 66, *κυνός ποτ' ἐπενεχθέντος διαστρηθέντα εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν αἰτιασάμενον, ως χαλεπὸν εἴη ὀλοσχερώς ἐκόνναιται τὸν ἄνθρωπον, hominem escire.* Elsewhere I have not met with it before the following: Dion. Hal. A.R. xi. 5 *οὐκέτι μετριάζοντες, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ταρκίνιον ἐκένον ἐνδύμενοι.* Lucian ii. 730 *Gall.* 19 *ἄποδονάμενος δὲ τὸν Πνιθαγόραν τίνας μετημφιάσω μετ' αὐτὸν; Paul. ad Rom. vi. 6 ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος ἀνεσταυρώθη.* xiii. 14 *ἐνδύσασθε*

τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν on which Wetstein (to whom I owe several of my examples) quotes Chrysostom *H.* 24 et in *Ephes. H.* 13 οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ φίλων λέγομεν, ὁ δέντα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνδύσατο, τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην λέγοντες καὶ τὴν ἀδιάλειπτον συνονσίαν. *ad Galat.* iii. 27 Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθε. *ad Ephes.* iv. 22 ἀποθέσθαι<sup>1</sup> τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον 24 ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καυνὸν ἄνθρωπον. *ad Coloss.* iii. 9, 10 ἀπεκδυσάμενοι<sup>1</sup> τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἐνδύσαμενοι τὸν νέον. Euseb. *Vit. Const.* prooem. 1 p. 9 Heinichen *νυνὶ δὲ οὐλοὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδύσαμενοι* (τὸν Καίσαρα) ‘assumed.’ Liban. *Epist.* 956 Φιρμίνος μύθας τὸν στρατιώτην ἐνδὺν<sup>1</sup> τὸν σοφιστήν. So I understand Rufin. A.P. v. 73. 6 σὺ, δοκῶ, τὴν θὲν ἐνδέδυκας<sup>1</sup> v.l. (as I had conjectured) for ἐκδέδυκας: ‘you, Rhodocleia, I imagine, have put on the goddess’: not as Bothe takes it, ‘deam expoliasti.’ Choricius Boissonade p. 190 ἀπέβον<sup>1</sup> τὸν πρεσβευτὴν καὶ τὸ σύννονον . . . ἀπεδύσων<sup>1</sup> τὸν ὅπλιτην. Eumath. i. 7 ἀπόθου<sup>1</sup> τὸν πρεσβευτὴν, ἀπόθου τὸν κύρκα. Another verb was ἐπιδύκνυσθαι, to display: Marc. Anton. i. 7 τὸν ἐνεργητικὸν ἄνδρα ἐπιδύκνυσθαι: and the opposite of *denying* or *concealing* your manhood was to *show* it, δεῖξαι: in Lucian ii. 382 an effeminate young man, on being taunted by Demonax with μαλακία, retorts αἰτίκα σοι μάλα τὸν ἄνδρα δεῖξω.<sup>1</sup> Clem. Al. p. 263. 22 ὁ δὲ (Man) προϊκάτῳ γὰρ τὸ λεῖον, ἔμενε τε ἀνήρ καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα δεικνυει.<sup>1</sup> Julian Μαστούγων p. 38 (Paris 1583) διδῷμι γὰρ αὐτὸς τὴν αἰτίαν, ὥστερ οἱ τράγοι τὸ γένειον ἔχων, ἔξον, οὔμαι, λεῖον αὐτὸς ποιεῖν καὶ ψιλόν, ὥσπερ οἱ καλοὶ τὸν παιδῶν ἔχουσιν ἄπασαί τε αἱ γυναῖκες, αἱς φύσει πρόστεστοι τὸ ἔρασμον. ὑμές δὲ (people of Antioch) καὶ ἐν τῷ γῆρᾳ ἐγλωνύτες τὸν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν νίκας καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄβροτάτου<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἵστως ἀπλοντάτου τρόπου λεῖον ἐπιμελῶς ἐργάζεσθε, τὸν ἄνδρα ἀποφαίνοντες καὶ παραδεικνύοντες<sup>1</sup> διὰ τοῦ μετόπου καὶ οὐχ ὥστερ ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν γνάθων.

The phrase in these last passages derives from a philosophical idea. The Puritan school of morality—Pythagorizers, Laoconizers, Cynics, Stoics, Christian Fathers and their followers—held it a *denial of manhood* to shave the hair upon the face<sup>2</sup>; so that

<sup>1</sup> ὑπὸ λαβροτάτου in this edition, but rightly translated ‘pro ista vestra delicatissima vita.’—In case they have not been made, the following corrections are worth noting: p. 91 οἱ πάντας (as suggested, or πάντι) εἰς τὰ θεατρά γ' ἐποιημένοι for πάντες and πεποιημένοι: p. 140 λιμὸν ἀλοιφῆρα βροτεῖω, ὡς ὁ θεὸς (?) ἔφη for ἀλύτηρα (the translation has ‘fame’ vexatricem mortalium’).

<sup>2</sup> Pythagoreans, later at any rate (Ath. 163 e, f), wore the rest of their hair long too: Stoics cut it close (Jahn, Persius p. 155, Orelli-Mewes on Hor. Ep. i. 18. 7). κομῆτης commonly implied κίναδος, which is the point of Caracalla’s contemptuous

the πάγων became with the τρίβων the badge and symbol of their life. Here is an anecdote from Plutarch's life of Phocion, c. 10: ἦν δέ τις Ἀρχιβαῦδης ἐπικαλούμενος Λακωνιστής, πάγωνά τε καθεμένος ὑπερφῆν μεγέθει καὶ τρίβων φορῶν ἀεὶ καὶ σκυθρωπάζον τούτον ἐν βούλῃ θορυβούμενος ὁ Φωκίον ἐπεκαλεῖτο τῷ λόγῳ μάρτυν ἡμα καὶ βοηθόν. ὃς δὲ ἀναστὰς ἐκεῖνος ἢ πρὸς χάριν ἦν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις συνεβούλενεν, ἀψάμενος αὐτοῦ τῶν γενεών 'ὦ Ἀρχιβαῦδη' εἶπε 'τί οὖν οὐδὲ ἀτεκίω;' Χρυσίππος (quoted by Ath. 565a) says τὸ ἔρεσθαι τὸν πάγωνα κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον προῆκται (παρῆκται Kaibel 'introduced'), τῶν προτέρων οὐ χρωμένων αὐτῷ . . . And then he mentions two sayings of Diogenes: Διογένης δὲ τῶν τινα οὐτῶς ἔχοντα τὸ γένειον ἔφης 'μή τι ἔχεις ἐγκαλεῖν τὴν φύσειν, ὅτι ἡ ἀνδρας σε ἐποίησε καὶ οὐ γυναῖκα;' ἔτερον δὲ τινα ἐπὶ ἵππου παραπλησίως ἔχοντα καὶ μεμυρισμένον καὶ τούτοις ἀκολούθος ἡμιφειρμένον, πρότερον μὲν ἔφητο ἔγειν τί ἔστων ὁ ἵπποπόρος, νῦν δὲ ἐνρέκειν. Tertull. *de spectaculis* 33 placesit et ille qui virtus suonovaacula mutat? infidelis erga faciem suam . . . non amat falsum auctor veritatis: adulterium est apud illum omne quod fingitur. proinde vocem, sexus, aetates mentientem . . . non probabit qui omnem hypocrisis damnat. The Stoics found shaving to be in conflict with two of their main principles; it was *contrary to nature*, and it was not *manly*. Their position is most clearly stated by Musonius περὶ κονρᾶς (Stob. *Flor.* vi. 62) . . . τὸν δὲ πάγωνα καὶ σύμβολον γεγονέα τοῦ ἄρρενος, ὥσπερ ἀλεκτρίνοι λόφον καὶ λεωτί χάτην. οὗτον τῆς μὲν κόμης ἀφαιρετέον εἴναι τὸ ἐνοχλοῦν, τὸν δὲ πάγωνος οὐδέν, οὐδὲ γάρ ἐνοχλεῖν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ἔστι ἀνγάγει τὸ σῶμα . . . Then he quotes Zeno with approval as saying τούτον ἔνεκα καρτέον οὐ καὶ κομητέον, τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν, ἵνα μὴ βαρύμενός τις ὑπὸ τῆς κόμης μηδὲ ἐνοχλούμενός τις πρὸς μηδέμιαν ἔνεργειαν: and continues οὗτον καὶ καρτέον μόνης ἔνεκα τῆς ἀφαιρέσεως τοῦ περιττοῦ, καὶ οὐχὶ κόσμον χάριν, ὥσπερ οἰνοταὶ δεῖν ἔνοι, τὰ μὲν γένεα λεανόμενοι καὶ μιμούμενοι τοὺς ἀγενίους, ἢ τὴν Δία τοὺς ἄρτι γενεάστακτας· τίρη δὲ κεφαλὴν οὐχ δύοις κειρόμενοι, διαφόρως δὲ τὰ προσώπων τῶν δύοις. καὶ γάρ τοι δοκῶν εἴναι κόσμος οὗτος πολλὴν ἀκοριμάν ἔχει, καὶ διαφέρει οὐδὲν τοῦ καλλωπισμοῦ τοῦ τῶν γυναικῶν. ἐκεῖνα τε γάρ . . . οἵ τε κειρόμενοι οὐτῶς κατάδηλοι εἰσιν δι' ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ φαίνεσθαι καλοὶ οἱς βούλονται ἀρέσκειν . . . ως ἀν εὔοπτοι εἰεν γυναιξί τε καὶ παισιν ὑψ' ὃν ἐπανεισθαι

observation on Philiscus with his effeminate mien and voice, τὸν μὲν ἀνδρα δεκυνσιν ἡ κόμη, τὸν δὲ φίτρα ἡ φωνή (Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* ii. 30 p. 262 Dübner).

δέονται. ηδη δέ τινες καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ βαρύνεσθαι τὰς τρίχας κείρονται καὶ λεαίνουσι τὰ γένεια, σταφῶς οὐτοί γε κατεαγότες ὑπὸ τῆς τριφῆς καὶ ἐκνευρισμένοι πανταπάσιν, οἵ γε ἀνέχονται ἀνδρόγυνοι καὶ γυναικώδεις ὄρασθαι ὄντες, ὅπερ ἔδει φεύγειν ἐξ ἀπαντος, εἰ δη τῷ ὄντι ἂν δρεις ησαν τι γάρ δή καὶ εἰσὶν αἱ τρίχες ἀνθρώποις βάρος; . . . It has been recognised that Clement of Alexandria derived largely from Musonius,<sup>1</sup> and the whole of *Paed.* iii. 3 πρὸς τὸν καλλωπιζομένους τῶν ἀνδρῶν is little more than a rhetorical amplification of this theme. I have already made three extracts from that chapter, and have an object in making yet two more: p. 263. 14 τοῦτο οὖν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸ σύνθημα, δέ οὐ καταφαίνεται ὁ ἀνήρ. 263. 28 τὸ οὖν τῆς ἀνδρώδους φύσεως σύμβολον, τὸ λάσιον, παρανομεῖν ἀνόσιον τὸ δικαλλωπισμα τῆς λεάντεως—θερμαίνομα γάρ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου—εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας, θραυδρίους εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, μοιχοῦ. Cf. Synes. *Laud. Calv.* p. 58-9 (ed. Turneb.). Now let us look at a fragment of Alexis (264) quoted by Athenaeus 565 b, the same passage as before:

<ἀν> πιττοκοπούμενόν τιν' ἡ ξυρούμενον ὄρφας, τοῦτον ἔχει τι θάτερον (sic)  
ἡ γάρ ἐρατείνειν ἐπινοεῖν μοι φαίνεται.  
καὶ πάντα τῷ πάγωνι δρᾶν ἐναντία,<sup>2</sup>

ἡ πλουσιακὸν τούτῳ <τι> προσπίπτει κακόν·  
τι γάρ αἱ τρίχες λυποῖσιν ἡμᾶς, πρὸς θεῶν,  
δέ ἂς ἀνήρ ἐκαστος ἡμῶν φαίνεται,  
εἰ μή τι ταύταις ἀντιπράτεοθ' ὑπονοεῖς;

that is 'unless you suppose that designs are entertained against them and the manhood which they symbolize.' Remark the resemblances in phrase between this and the passages of Musonius and Clement, and if there should remain a doubt that the speaker here is using the language of philosophy, it should be removed by the word πλουσιακόν. It is not, of course, ordinary Attic; it has the air of a technical word, and so it is; when we meet it next it is in the vocabulary of Stoicism: Marc. Anton. i. 3 τὸ λιτὸν κατὰ τὴν διαταταν καὶ πόρρω τῆς πλουσιακῆς διαγωγῆς. Gataker's note upon the word is right: 'est enim a πλούσιος, non a πλούτος, eformatum. διαγωγήν autem πλουσιακήν Marcus dixit quod δρᾶμα πλουσιακόν Plutarchus *de avaritia* [Mor. 528 B] pomparam illam epularum sumpt-

<sup>1</sup> Wendland *Quaestiones Musonianae* (noticed by Prof. Mayor in *Class. Rev.* i p. 74).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dio. Chrys. II p. 29 K. ὅταν ἀνήρ τις ἀν τὸν χαρακῆρα ἔχων τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τὴν ἐναντίαν καὶ τὰ σημεῖα τῆς φύσεως μὴ δυνάμενος ἀνελεῖν . . . πάντα βούληται ποιεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ὃν πέφυκε, which last seven words may very well be verse.

tuosam ac magnificam quae apud ditiores exhiberi solet. At Alexis apud Athenaeum lib. 13 πλονιακὸν κακόν etiam *mollitem* dixit.' It means 'a vice arising from a life of sybaritic luxury,' as in Musonius also τρυφή is the other motive suggested for the practice. What the first is we have been very plainly told; to make themselves appear attractive in the eyes of women, or of others (cf. Lucian's ironical advice to the aspiring orator, iii. 24): and therefore for the absurd στρατεύειν of the MSS I have substituted ἐρατεύειν 'to play the ἐρατός' (ἐρατός δὲ γυναιξίν Tyrtaeus 10. 29), as natural a verb as ὑπατεύειν is from ὑπατός. The Attic prose form of the adjective was ἐραστός, ἐπέραστος (see e.g. Lucian i. 206-7); but ἐραστεύειν had been already coined as early as Aeschylus *P.V.* 922 in the active sense 'to be a lover,' from ἐραστής. The Epic ἐρατίζειν also had the active sense, and when Photius records the word, 'Ἐραστριᾶν καὶ Ἐρατίζειν (Schleusner for ἐρωτίζειν)

λέγοντες, it is in the active sense I suppose we are to understand it.

There are many passages in Greek and Latin literature which cannot be appreciated without familiarity with the current language of philosophy<sup>1</sup>; Kock here calls πλονιακόν 'manifesto corruptum.'

Three more examples will complete the list I have at present: 'Lucian' ii. 425 μεταβάς δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παιδός εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα. Euseb. *Vit. Const.* i. 19 p. 35 H̄einenchen ἥδη δ' ἄρτι ἐκ παιδός (as corrected) ἐτὶ τὸν veavias διαβάς. Synesius in Reiske's *Dio Chrys.* I. p. 13 ὅστις φιλόσοφος ὦν εἰς τὸν σοφιστὴν ἔλκεται.

W. HEADLAM.

<sup>1</sup> For instance in Aesch. *Cho.* 956 I see some editors content to acquiesce in κρατεῖται τὸ θεῖον. Surely a strange kind of οὐρανούχος ἄρχα, and a strange form of *Te Deum!* But it would also be a contradiction in terms. From Xenophanes downwards the very condition which defined and limited τὸ θεῖον was τὸ κρατεῖν:—would they not rather express their triumphant exultation by exclaiming κρατεῖ πως τὸ θεῖον ἀεί?

#### THE DIVISION OF SYLLABLES IN GREEK.

AMONGST the questions of Greek orthography which were considered when the *Oxford Classical Texts* were prepared for the press was that of the right division of words at the end of the line. It was found, on examining the editions in current use, that the rules which govern this practice were not always strictly observed; and a memorandum was therefore issued to editors, press-readers and printers, in which certain principles were laid down for their guidance. It does not appear, however, that an accurate knowledge of these principles is general amongst scholars, and erroneous statements are not infrequently to be met with, even in the pages of the *Classical Review*. On p. 31 of the present volume Mr. J. H. Moulton gives as examples of irregular divisions drawn from παγyri ἀποκαθεσ-ταρένον, which is legitimate, and δρα-χμάς, which is correct. Even the discussion of the subject in Kühner-Blass, *Griechische Grammatik* I. § 91 is not free from incidental error. The statement that a combination of three consonants is not found in Greek unless the first be σ or the last ρ (based on Choeroboscus) finds an exception in ἄπτλος and its derivatives, to say nothing of the proper names Ἀλκμαίων, Ἀλκμήνη. I have therefore thought it worth while to restate as briefly as possible the

laws to be observed in this matter and the principles underlying them.

The general principle that the division of words at the end of the line should coincide with the close of a spoken syllable needs no discussion or justification. As will be seen, it only obtained gradual recognition amongst the Greeks themselves; but when once established, it remained unquestioned. Now 'syllabification,' which, as writers on Phonetics have pointed out, is due to the breaking-up of the sentence, regarded as a continuous flow of sound, by interruptions in expiration, is a matter of pronunciation; in the case of Greek, therefore, it can only be determined by inference. This practically means that we must accept the orthographical rules laid down by the Greeks themselves as reflecting actual pronunciation, for the evidence to be derived from other sources—which will be mentioned later on—is extremely slight.

What then were the rules laid down by the Greeks on the question of syllable-division? The answer to this question may be drawn either from an examination of the most carefully written documents (literary papyri of early date) and of inscriptions, or from the study of Greek grammatical tradition. It will be convenient to treat

these two sources of information separately, and we may legitimately describe the one as 'ancient practice,' and the other as 'ancient theory'; for although the rules actually observed spring from the application of a theory communicated by education, yet the nature of such instruction was without doubt essentially practical, whereas the grammarians, as will shortly be seen, treat of syllable-division as part of a wider subject and are concerned rather with its *rationales* than with its practical application.

**I. Ancient practice.**—Our earliest witnesses are the inscriptions, although the beginnings of strict division are but little anterior to the Ptolemaic papyri. The custom of inscribing documents in the style known as *στοιχηδόν* prevailed in Attica until the close of the fourth century, and, since it involved the disposition of letters in vertical columns and consequently the assignment of a uniform number of letters to each line of the inscription, excluded all possibility of phonetic division. In the Attic inscriptions not thus disposed (e.g. C.I.A. II 52 c [369/8 B.C.], C.I.A. II 55 [362 B.C.], C.I.A. II 114 [342/1 B.C.], C.I.A. IV 2, 179<sup>b</sup>, ll. 66-80 [325 B.C.]), irregularities occur with varying degrees of frequency. In other parts of Greece, however, inscriptions of the fourth century are found which display the strict observance of rules. A good example is furnished by the Elean decree set up in Olympia circ. 350 B.C. recording honours conferred on Democrates of Tenedos (Ditzenberger-Purgold 39.) But this is an exceptional case. With the period of the Diadochi, however, a change begins. The rescript of Alexander inscribed at Chios (*Revue de Philologie*, 1893, p. 188) is accurately divided; and although instances of laxity are to be found in the letter of Antigonus to Teos (Hicks, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* 149) and the decree of Cassander (Ditzenberger 127), the stone copies of the rescripts of the Diadochi are generally accurate in their divisions, while the stone-cutters of the king of Pergamon were trained from the first to observe the rules of orthography (Schweizer, *Grammatik der pergamensischen Inschriften* p. 131 f.). The same is true of the Delphic Amphictyony and the city of Delphi, while in Athens, as the *στοιχηδόν* style was abandoned, it was gradually, though not immediately, replaced by the rule of syllable-division. We find, it is true, a number of third century inscriptions in which no attention is paid to syllabic division (e.g. C.I.A. II 317 [282 B.C.] and C.I.A. II 331 [cire. 272 B.C.]);

but a gradual progress may be traced in this respect. This is especially noticeable in the case of the ephabetic inscriptions (C.I.A. II 478 *sqq.*).<sup>1</sup>

With the third century B.C., to which the triumph of the strict observance in inscriptions thus belongs, begins the series of papyri. From the Ptolemaic period onwards, these documents present but few deviations from the rules of orthography. This is especially true of the literary papyri; the non-literary documents (except some of the more important official documents such as the Ptolemaic Revenue Papyrus) do not, as might be expected, conform so precisely to the orthographical standard, although the rarity of mistakes proves that Greek education was very thorough in this respect, while their absence even from documents whose orthography is generally incorrect shews that the rules closely reflected actual pronunciation and were therefore followed by instinct.<sup>2</sup>

What then are the rules which Greek scribes and lapidaries are found to observe? They may be stated briefly as follows:—

General rule: *Each vowel (or diphthong) ends a syllable.*

Exceptions:—

(1) The first of two doubled consonants belongs to the preceding syllable.

This covers the case of the groups *κ-χ*, *π-φ*, *τ-θ* which are in reality doubled consonants (cp. the spelling **BAXXE** Kretschmer *Vaseninschriften*, p. 174).

(2) The first of two or more consonants, if a liquid or nasal, belongs to the preceding syllable.

Thus we divide *πάντες*, *ἀνθρώπων*, *θέλακτρον*. There is, however, one exception to this rule; *μν* are not divided. Cp. *γυμνάσιον*, *Inscriften von Pergamon*, 458, 4/5, *λιμνάις*, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* II 221, etc.

<sup>1</sup> References to these will be found in Meisterhans *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*<sup>3</sup>, p. 7 f. Some inscriptions not there included amongst the examples of 'strict' division might be added, as the exceptions are found in editorial supplements (C.I.A. II 485 and 488); while C.I.A. II 471 and 481 (which Meisterhans includes) show *φαν/επολ* and *προνη/έσια* respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Exaggerated statements have been made on this subject. Mr. Kenyon (*Palaeography of Greek Papyri* p. 31 n.) rightly condemns Wattenbach's dictum that the division of words in Egyptian papyri is 'ganz regellos'; but his own statement as to the accuracy even of non-literary papyri is far too sweeping. See the letters of Gemellus (No. 112) and Harpocration (No. 127) in *Fayum Towns and their Papyri* for examples of irregular division.

(3)  $\sigma$ , when followed by one or more consonants, is often attached to the preceding vowel.

Practice is very variable in this matter. The Attic and Pergamene inscriptions, with but few exceptions, divide  $\sigma$  from the following consonant or consonants (Meisterhans, *op. cit.* p. 82<sup>o</sup>, Schweizer, *op. cit.* p. 132). In many, if not most, of the best literary papyri, on the other hand, such as those of Bacchylides and Thucydides (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri I* 16), the division is made before  $\sigma$ . The papyrus containing the *Euripiades* of Hyperides, however, divides *after*  $\sigma$  (Blass, *Hyperides*<sup>3</sup> *Praef.* p. xvii.). It is not, however, true to say as Blass does in Müller's *Handbuch* I<sup>o</sup> p. 310 that the practice of the same scribe is always consistent. Both in inscriptions and papyri inconsistencies are found in the same document.

(4) In the case of compounds, the logical division is sometimes carried through at the expense of phonetic rule.

This seems to be regular in the case of *ēk* (εξ), *eis* and *πρὸς* when followed by a consonant. When a vowel follows we do indeed find such divisions as *ἐξ ἀξεῖ* Dittenberger 353, 35/6, *ἐξ-εἰλέτο* in the Bachylides papyrus (V 74/5), and *ειρ-αγγεῖα* more than once in the Hyperides MS. already referred to; but this is not the prevailing practice. *ἐν* and *συν* are also at times written separately from the following vowel (*ἐν-εργουμένος* Dittenberger 353, 108/9). *Κράτης* nevertheless has a preposition whose final vowel is elided in composition forming a syllable. Examples are *ταρ-[στρος]* in the Thucydides papyrus from Oxyrhynchus and *ταρ-εχώντων* in Cauer, *Delectus* 181, 22/3—a long inscription recording a treaty between Rhodes and Hierapytna, correctly divided but for two examples of *Ιεπατρ-ιών-* *(οις)*. The Pergamene inscriptions furnish three instances.

[NOTE.—It must be emphasised that in ancient Greek writing the syllable often oversteps the limits of the word. This is the case under two sets of conditions. (1) Atonic prepositions, such as *εκ* and *ον*, or particles such as *οὐκ* (*οὐχ*) are joined with the following word for the purpose of syllabification, *ε-κ τούτον*, *ο-υ-χ γῆιστα* and so forth being the normal divisions. (2) Elision binds the word whose final vowel is lost to that which follows, so that we have *κα-τ' ἐμοῦ*, *φο-θ' ἵκετο* (Bacchyl. xv. 15/6) and so on.]

**II. Ancient theory.**—Our knowledge of the rules laid down by the great grammarians of antiquity depends (apart from casual references) on the fragmentary remains of Herodian's treatise on orthography preserved by late compilers and excerptors. These will be found in Lentz's *Herodian* II 393 ff and 401 ff. Unfortunately

nately Lentz's arrangement obscures the fact that all the statements derived from Herodian were to be found in the first part of his work *περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, which bore the heading *περὶ συντάξεως τῶν καὶ στοιχείων*. Furthermore, Lentz failed to make use of the tract published by Göttling under the name of 'Theodosius.' This epitome, poor as it is, is not without a certain value; some of its lacunae may be supplied by the rather fuller excerpts of Joannes Charax, on which Egenolf *Die orthographischen Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur* should be consulted. Reitzenstein (*Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* p. 301 ff.) has recently published (from a palimpsest at Leipzig) some scanty remains of the commencement of Herodian's treatise. The most important fact which we learn from them is that Herodian's work was based immediately upon that of Tryphon: this is the inference drawn, no doubt rightly, by Reitzenstein from the fact that a list of authorities on orthography reaches its climax in the words *αὗτός τι δὲ Τρύφων*.<sup>2</sup>

Of orthographical treatises other than that of Herodian we know practically nothing. His great rival, Apollonius Dyscolus, likewise wrote *περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, but we can recover nothing of his doctrines apart from one or two arguments from orthographical analogy drawn by Apollonius himself in the *Syntax*. Possibly the arrangement of the subject under the three heads of *ποσότης*, *ποιότης*, *μερισμός*, to which Sextus Empiricus<sup>3</sup> refers, may be his, since the order (and nomenclature) of Herodian differs slightly—*σύνταξις*, *ποιότης*, *ποσότης*.

It lies outside the scope of this article to examine in detail the fragments of the treatises to which we have referred. The rules which are there laid down are those which we find in actual observance, and their statement is not remarkably logical. It will suffice to say a few words as to the method of treatment which the grammarians adopt.

The division of syllables falls under the more general head of *σύνταξις* (more fully *σύνταξις τῶν καὶ στοιχείων*), with which, however, it is not coextensive. *Σύνταξις* denotes the *order* or *combination* of letters, and it was under this head that the grammarians discussed what combinations of consonants were permissible, whether *initial*, *medial* or *final*. In the second of these three cases they were brought face to face

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand we find ἡ-ξύτες Fayum Towns and their Papri xii 19/20.

with the question of syllable-division; for when the consonants were distributed between two syllables, combinations were possible which would be illegitimate at the beginning of a word.

The rules laid down for such division were cumbrous and unsystematic. The following are the most important.<sup>1</sup>

1. Every consonant standing between two vowels in one word (or in two words connected by elision) belongs to the second vowel.

2. Every syllable ending in a consonant is followed by a syllable beginning with a consonant.

3. Every syllable beginning with a vowel is preceded by a syllable ending in a vowel.

4. Groups of consonants which are found initially are not divided medially.

5. Other combinations, not permissible initially, are also undivided medially.

[Herodian (An. Ox. IV 332, 10) gives  $\bar{\theta}\mu$ ,  $\bar{\phi}\nu$ ,  $\gamma\delta$ ,  $\bar{\chi}\mu$ ,  $\kappa\mu$ ,  $\sigma\gamma$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}\delta$  as examples. Some of these are of course found initially in dialectic forms. See also Ioannes Charax ap. Egenolff, *op. cit.* p. 13. Apollonius Dyscolus (*Synt.* p. 7 Bk.) distinguishes *συλλαβεῖ προτακτικαί* (Herodian used the term *ἀρκτικαὶ ὑποτακτικαὶ, ληκτικαὶ*). Under the first head fall aspirated vowels, under the second syllables containing the consonants  $\gamma\mu$ ,  $\kappa\mu$ ,  $\chi\mu$ , under the third those terminated by  $\lambda\varsigma$ ,  $\rho\varsigma$ ,  $\nu\varsigma$ .]

6. Doubled consonants are always divided.

7. Liquids and nasals preceding (a) mutes (b) other liquids and nasals (except in the case of  $\mu\nu$ , which falls under rule 4) belong to the previous syllable.

8. Two mutes whether tenues ( $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\tau}$   $\bar{\pi}\bar{\tau}$ ), mediae ( $\beta\delta$   $\gamma\delta$ ) or aspirates ( $\bar{\chi}\theta$   $\phi\theta$ ) are not divided.

9. No syllable ends in an aspirate.

[This rule is framed to meet the cases of  $\bar{\tau}\theta$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}\phi$  which should rather fall under the head of doubled consonants, and of such words as  $\lambda\chi\theta\rho\varsigma$ .]

10. A legitimate conjunction of consonants becomes illegitimate if their order is reversed.

[Thus e.g.  $\bar{\theta}\bar{\nu}$  are found  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\lambda\lambda\eta\psi\epsilon$  ( $\lambda\bar{\nu}\theta\bar{\nu}\sigma$ ), but  $\bar{\nu}\theta$  are not ( $\lambda\bar{\nu}\theta\bar{\nu}$ ). This rule is also mentioned by Apollonius Dyscolus (*Synt.* p. 58, 2 Bk.).]

11. The ordinary rules of division apply also in the case of compounds.

<sup>1</sup> Consonants which are not separated in syllable-division are said to be  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\lambda\lambda\eta\psi\epsilon$ ; those which are so separated are  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\epsilon\epsilon$ .

[Such is the doctrine attributed to Herodian by Priscian (II 2, p. 89 K.); but his words<sup>2</sup> make it clear that the point was a subject of controversy.]

Besides general rules such as the above, we find statements which apply to particular letters. The most important case is that of  $\sigma$ . Herodian (see Lentz II 393, 16 ff., 391, 4 and add Ioannes Charax ap. Egenolff *op. cit.* p. 13) ruled that  $\sigma$  should always be  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\lambda\lambda\eta\psi\epsilon$  with the following consonant, and the same is implied by Hephaestion (p. 7); but, as we have seen, the practice of inscriptions and papyri fluctuates, and Sextus Empiricus (*adv. math.* p. 638 Bk.) mentions that the division of such a word as *'Αριστίων* was a moot point amongst grammarians.<sup>3</sup>

Exceptions to this treatment of  $\sigma$  were recognised in the case of compounds formed with  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\pi\rho\varsigma$  and  $\delta\sigma\varsigma$  when followed by a consonant; when a vowel followed, however, the division took place before  $\sigma$ .<sup>4</sup>

Examples of particular laws are

(a) Every syllable ending in  $\sigma$  (subject to the exceptions just mentioned) is followed by a syllable beginning with  $\sigma$ .

(b)  $\rho$  is never preceded by a consonant  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\epsilon\epsilon$  unless that consonant be  $\rho$ .

(c) Every syllable ending in  $\mu$  is followed by a syllable beginning with one of the letters  $\pi\beta\phi\psi\mu$ .

From these and the like premises deductions were drawn as to the legitimacy of phonetic formations. Thus Herodian argued<sup>5</sup> that the perfect of *vēμω* should by analogy be *vēλαμκα* (cf. *έφθαρκα*); but this was impossible, since  $\bar{\mu}\bar{\kappa}$  was an illegitimate conjunction. For (1)  $\mu\bar{\kappa}$  could not co-exist  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\lambda\lambda\eta\psi\epsilon$ , since the conjunction would be a reversal of the legitimate  $\bar{\kappa}\mu$  ( $\lambda\bar{\kappa}\mu\bar{\iota}$ ) [v. rule 10]. (2)  $\bar{\mu}\bar{\kappa}$  could not co-exist  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\epsilon\epsilon$ ,

<sup>2</sup> Herodianus de orthographia ostendit rationibus esse sonoriisque quantum ad ipsam vocis prolationem in compositis quoque simplicium regulam in ordinandis syllabarum litteris servare.

<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to see what doubt could have arisen in the other instance given in this passage ( $\delta\bar{\beta}\mu\mu\sigma$  or  $\delta\bar{\beta}\mu\mu\sigma$ , where the first division is the correct one). It seems possible that as the  $\gamma$  in such a word as  $\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\mu\sigma$  became nasalised and gave rise to the spelling  $\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\mu\sigma$ , recommended by Herodian (II 408 L), so  $\beta$  in  $\delta\bar{\beta}\mu\mu\sigma$  may have been similarly affected (cp. the spelling  $\delta\mu\beta\mu\mu\sigma$ ), and it may have been held by some that it should be treated as a nasal.

<sup>4</sup> So too, though  $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$  before consonants was  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\epsilon\epsilon$ . Papyri shew divergences in this case, as was shewn above.

<sup>5</sup> Lentz II. 398, 17 ff.

for a syllable ending in  $\mu$  must be followed by one beginning with  $\pi \beta \phi \psi \mu$  [above, (c)].

It would be tedious to pursue this subject further. Enough has been said to shew how cumbrous were the rules by which the grammarians obscured the simple phenomena of syllable-division, as well as how the subject was by them treated in a wider connexion. A word must be added, however, as to the doctrine of the 'rhythmicians' with regard to *quantity* in its bearing upon this question. 'Metric' deals with *conventional* quantity and recognises two degrees only; but the professors of 'rhythmic,' who regarded the phenomena of rhythm and metre from a somewhat less narrow point of view, had something to say as to *natural* quantity, or the absolute time-value of syllables. They did not indeed anticipate modern writers on Phonetics in postulating an ascending scale of vowel-quantities such as has been found, for example, in English.<sup>1</sup> But they refer to the time-value of *consonants* in the syllable. Thus Choeroboscus<sup>2</sup> attributes to the *ρύθμικοί* the doctrine that the time-value of a consonant is half a *χρόνος πτώσης* (the 'time-unit,' equivalent to the short syllable of 'metric'), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>3</sup> constructs an ascending scale of 'short' syllables, illustrated by the words *όδος*, *Ρόδος*, *τρόπος* and *στρόφος*, and gives *σταλήν* as an example of the longest of 'long' syllables. But it is important to note that in these speculations no account is taken of the conventions by which *metrical* quantity is determined. For the consonants which produce length 'by position' are those which *follow* the vowel; whereas the *ρύθμικοί* assign a time-value to those which *precede* it. And further, the *ρύθμικοί* in their division of syllables presuppose the current rules of orthography. Thus Marius Victorinus (Aphthonius)<sup>4</sup> takes the final syllable of *Θέρανδος* as an example of short vowel + 3 consonants; whereas, metrically speaking, the quantity of the second syllable is determined by the consonants belonging by rule to the last.

We have now considered the theory and practice of the Greeks themselves in the matter of syllable-division: it remains to enquire whether the rules which they observed in writing accurately reflected the

<sup>1</sup> V. Sweet, *Handbook of Phonetics*, p. 59. The Romance languages do not possess anything like so rich a gamut of quantity as those of the Teutonic family, and ancient Greek was probably like them in this respect.

<sup>2</sup> In Heph. p. 34 Stud.

<sup>3</sup> *De comp. verb.* c. 15.

P. 39, 6 ff. K.

pronunciation in use. From the nature of the case it is extremely difficult to obtain any evidence on this subject; a brief notice of two or three points must suffice.

(1) Misspellings due to 'haplography,' or the omission of one of two identical syllables, may throw light on the division of words. Thus the spelling ἀνεωράμην for ἀνενεωράμην points to the pronunciation *ἀ-ne-wor-á-mηn* and thus justifies Heroilian's rule as to prepositions elided in composition (Schweizer, *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften* p. 131).

(2) In certain cases we find a consonant doubled between two vowels, from which we may infer that the Greeks wavered in pronouncing the consonant in question between two syllables. Now in by far the greater number of these cases the consonant is either a liquid, nasal or  $\sigma$ , explosives being rarely doublet. G. Meyer (*Griechische Grammatik* § 289) quotes Χαροπέα *ἰχθύός* and ναῦλον, W. Schulze (*K.Z.* xxxii 397 and *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 1896, p. 250) ἄνν *άν*, πανηφαστιών, εἰραγωγήν, ὕσπειρός. Kretschmer (*Griechische Vaseninschriften* p. 50) shews that doubling of  $\nu$  is common at Gortyn and (p. 174) collects examples of an analogous phenomenon, viz. the very common doubling of  $\sigma$  before a consonant (NESTSTOP &c.) in vase-inscriptions. Schweizer (*op. cit.* p. 132) states that the doubling of  $\sigma$  is the most frequent case, that of nasals less so; but this seems hardly borne out by the facts. However, we may fairly argue from the fact that such doubling is extremely rare in the case of explosives that syllables ending in such were practically unknown in Greek.

(3) A more difficult question, which cannot here be discussed adequately, is raised by the conventions of metric in the matter of 'length by position' and 'common' quantity. Sievers (*Phonetik*<sup>4</sup> § 658) cuts the knot by the following statement: 'Syllables long by position are those which end in a consonant. The statement of the ancients that more than one must follow the vowel is due to the fact that consonants only end a syllable in such cases.' 'Common' quantity has been explained on the same lines as due to variation in syllable-division, as for example (*Soph. O. C.* 442).

Now Sievers' doctrine accords well with the

Now Sievers' doctrine accords well with the fact that 'liquid or nasal + mute, liquid or nasal' makes position; for in such cases the

first syllable ends in a consonant. And the sole exception—shortening before *μν* as in ἔμνωδεῖ Aesch. *Ag.* 990—would be due to the fact that *μν*, as an initial combination, belonged to the succeeding syllable. But we should expect, if the true ground of the convention were to be sought here, to find that such groups as *κτ*, *φθ* and the like permitted the shortening of a previous vowel, while the fluctuating treatment of *σ* in syllable-division would naturally be reflected in the ‘common’ quantity of a vowel followed by *σ* + cons.

It may be asked in conclusion what modifications or adaptations of the ancient rules should be adopted in modern printing.

Three would seem to be required:—

(1) The syllable should be confined within the limits of the word; *ἐκ τούτου, κατ' ἐμοῦ* and the like are unsuited to modern typography.

(2) A consistent rule should be observed in the case of *σ* + cons.

(3) Similar consistency is desirable in the case of compounds. Perhaps the occasional occurrence of ‘logical’ division (*παρόντες*) in ancient texts may be held to justify its adoption (as against *παρόντες κ.τ.λ.*) by modern printers.

H. STUART-JONES.

#### τοκέων ‘A PARENT’ AND THE KINDRED FORMS.

*τοκέων* (or *τεκέων*) is an old Ionic form to be restored in two epigrams of the *Anthology*, each of which uses it in reference to an old Ionian:

Meleager A.P. vii. 79: *εἰσ Ἡράκλειτον τὸν Ἐφέσιον, τὸν σοφόν, τὸν ἀγέλαστον.*

**ΗΡΑΚΛΑ.** *Ωιηρωπ'*, *Ἡράκλειτος ἐγώ σοφὰ μόνον ἀνευρεῖν φαμί· τά δ' ἐσ πάτραν κρέσσονα καὶ σοφίησ· λαξ γάρ καὶ τοκέωνας, ίώ ξένε, δύσφρονας ἄνδρας, ἥλακτεν. ΞΕΝΟC λαμπρὰ θρεψαμένοις χάρισ.*

**ΗΡ.** *οὐκ δ' ἐμεῦ; ΞΕΝ. μὴ τρηχύσ.*

**ΗΡ.** *ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ τρηχύτερον πάτρασ. ΞΕΝ. χαῖρε.*

**ΗΡ.** *σὺ δὲ ἐξ Ἐφέσου.*

Heraclitus: *I, sir, Heraclitus, claim to have been alone<sup>1</sup> in discovering wisdom: and surpassing even wisdom was my behaviour towards my people. Ay sir! for I assailed even my own parents, evil-minded folks, with contumelious abuse. Traveller: A brilliant return to those who brought you up!* Heraclitus: *Away from me!* Traveller: *No harshness!* Heraclitus: *Because you shall presently hear something harsher than my people did.* Traveller: *Farewell.* Heraclitus: *And you get out of Ephesus!*

The MS. readings are ἀνευρὼν in v. 1 and

<sup>1</sup> The Greek admits the sense ‘I was the only discoverer of wisdom,’ and this would be in character with the tradition about Heraclitus (Diog. Laert. ix. 1). But probably the meaning is rather ‘I made my discoveries unvoiced, single-handed,’ for he was definitely credited with this pretension: Diog. L. ix. 5, Suid. s.v. *Ἡράκλειτος*.

in v. 3 λαξ γάρ καὶ τοκέων ἀσίωι ξένε, the first hand having written *τεκέων ἀσίωι*

Leonidas A.P. vii. 408 εἰσ Ἰππώνακτα τὸν τῶν λάμβων ποντήν· ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ἐφέσιος. Ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείζετε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ὑπνῷ

πικρὸν ἐγείρητε σφῆκ' ἀναπανόμενον· ἅρτι γάρ Ἰππώνακτος καὶ τοκέωνε βανέξας ἄρτι κεκοίηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.

‘For the temper of Hipponeax, that snarled even at his parents, has only just been lulled to sleep in peace’.

Here the 1st hand of the Palatine wrote δ καὶ τοκέων εἴα leaving the verse unfinished; the reviser completes it with βανέξας. Planudes’ copy has δ καὶ τοκέων ἔο βανέξας, the οἶ having been altered from α in another ink.

Before proceeding to examine the form *τοκέων*, let me point out the steps that led to finding it. As usual, the plan was to eliminate improbabilities. In the first epigram θρεψαμένοις of course means ‘those who brought you up’, as Kaibel Ep. 121 Δωμὶς δρηστοσύνητον κεκαμένη, οἵτι ποθεωὴ θρεψαμένοις, τύμβον τοῦδε θαυμοῦ Ἑλαχον: and Heraclitus is required to say ‘I snarled at my parents’, otherwise there would be no relevance in the comment made on his remark. καὶ in both epigrams implies a degree to which the subject carried his moroseness. In the second the clue lies in βανέξας: the regular construction of βανέξειν and ἥλακτεν ‘to bark at’ *adlatrare* is an accusative of the object: βανέξειν (which appears to be rather the Ionic word) Heraclitus in Plut. Mor. 787 c ‘κίνες γάρ καὶ βανέζονται ὃν ἀν μὴ γνώσκωσι’ καὶ Ἡράκλειτον. Aesch. Pers. 13 νέον δὲ ἄνδρα βανέζει. ἥλακτεν Ar. Vesp. 1402,

Isoer. p. 8 c, Theocr. vi. 29, Polyb. xvi. 24. 6, Lucian i. 548, 605, ii. 924, Heraclid. Pont. (Bekk. An. 178. 27), Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* i. 19. 2, Ael. *N.A.* xi. 5, Diog. Laert. vi. 2. 60, θλαον Hom. π 5. Plutarch has ὑλακτεῖν τρός τυν in *Cimon* 18 (bis) and *Arat.* 8: κατά τυν would be Greek, though I have not found it except in Phot. *Bibl.* 109. 1 τὸν λαθράντις μιμέται τῶν κυνῶν καθ' ἡμῶν ὑλακτῶν: and καθυλακτεῖν τυν was in use with later writers. Planudes' ὁ καὶ τοκέων ἐο βανέας is merely a conjecture, and a bad one, for it is not grammar, nor more conceivable as Greek than λέγειν θεῶν for 'to speak against the Gods'. ὁ καὶ τοκέων καταβανέας, so far as grammar goes, would be correct, though I cannot see why it should have so baffled a transcriber. But there is another objection to it, which has been urged by Meineke: βανέας occurs often enough in verse, but it is always a tri-syllable, never βανέαι, βανέαι: and the adjective in Aesch. *Persae* is δυσβάντος, not

δυσβαντός. The presumption is that we have ὁ καὶ ... βανέας, the blank to be filled with an accusative τοκέων or τοκέωνa, and that is confirmed when we see how simple it is to read τοκέωνa in the other place. The loud call ὦ ξένη suits the rising tone of defiance there, and is used to hail a passer-by in Kaibel *Ep.* 241 οἱ διστοὶ συνόμαυροι, ὦ ξένη, τῷδε ἐνί τιμβῳ ἀμαντοῖς τεκέων κείμεθα κουριδίων. It always looked as though the same solution would account for both these epigrams.

The word may very well have been used by one of these antique Ephesians, for it is old Ionic. The class it belongs to is a small one, and in that class the dialects make many variations, all of which are exhibited by ξυνάν = κοινών. -άων may be taken as the central form, which on one side contracts into Doric -άν or into -άρ which is one sort of Ionic; on the other hand becomes in Ionic -ήν or -έων and in Attic -ών. You see the tendency in other cases:

Μενέλας ἀχαεσσα <sup>1</sup>	Μενέλαος	Μενέλεως ἡχηέας	Μενέλεως ἡχέεντα	Archilochus
χαιτέαις	χαιτήεις	χαιτήεις	χαιτήεντα	Simon. Amorg.
τελέαις	τελέηεις	τελέηεις	τελέεντα	Tytaeus
θρωμήεις	θρωμέεις	θρωμέεις	θρωμέεντα	? Archilochus
Θρήσσα	Θρήσσα	Θρέσσα	Θρέσσα	Herodas,
χρηΐζω	χρηΐζω	χρηΐζω	χρηΐζω	(Hipponactean)
ληζόμαι	ληζόμαι	ληζόμαι	λειζόμαι	

The chances are that from a list we shall learn something further:

'Αμυθάν	'Αμυθάων	'Αμυθέων		
'Αλκμάν	'Αμυθαονδαι	'Αλκμάων		
'Αλκμανίδαι	'Αλκμανίδαι	'Αλκμέαων		'Αλκμαλων
'Αλκμηνή	'Αλκμάνα	'Αλκμεωνίδαι		'Αλκμαιωνίσ ορ -ώνις
Σελήνη	Σελάνα			
Ποσιδάν	Ποσειδάων	Ποσιδέων	Ποσειδῶν ορ -ών	
Παιάν	Παιάων	Παιήων	Παιών	
'Ιάν	'Ιάων	'Ιηών	'Ιων	
'Ιάνη			'Ιωνίς	
Τιτήν	Τιτάν		Τιτώ	
Τιτηνίς	Τιτανίς			
Τιτηνή				
νεάν				
νεάνις				
Λυκάν	Λυκάων			
ξυνήγ	Τυφάων	Τυφέων	Τυφάν	
κοινανέω	ξυνδαων	ξυνήων	ξυνών	
	δηπάων		δηπέων	
			δηργεάων δηργίων	δηργειων δηργίων
Πορθάν	Πορθάων			
Ζήν	Ζάν			
μεγιστήν	ιδμάν			
κευθήν	μεγιστάν			
πευθήν				
ἐσσήν				

<sup>1</sup> Aesch. *Theb.* 899 δόμων μάλ' ἀχαεσσα ταῦς <προπομπὰ>.

<sup>1</sup> Le  
in -άν,  
189 sq.  
<sup>2</sup> Ph  
'Codex  
p. 1150

It appears from this comparison that the proper Ionic accent is paroxytone. ἀπατεών, λυμέων, πορθέων indeed are oxytone, and expressly mentioned as such by the grammarians on the subject of accentuation<sup>1</sup>; but these three are the only examples of the form (except proper names) they quote at all—doubtless because these alone survived as Attic. Dr. Postgate makes a suggestion which I readily accept: 'It seems possible that the accentuation of λυμέων etc. is an Attic innovation; caused, it may be, by confusion with the collectives.' These were invariably oxytone; and in their case too the old Ionic termination seems to have been -εών, as in πυλεών, ἐσχαρεών, ἀνθερεών, πρηγορεών, κενεών, while -ών was the true Attic. Later 'Attic' writers, however, often used the termination -άων, a use reprehended by Phrynicus: see Lobeck p. 166, to whose list add κωνωπέων. In the case of πρώι 'a promontory' we find the forms πρώι, πρώνες, πρέων, πρέοντος, πρηών, πρήνοντος: and besides ἀδρόν and ἀνδρεών there is a lengthened form ἀνδρεών used by Leon. Tar. A.P. ix. 322. 7 πατατάδι τις ποιοῦσδε καὶ ἀνδρεῶν καὶ αὐλὰν κορμεῖτο. Probably it was the call of metre that dictated this extension and also that of ὁργεων 'a performer of ritual' or 'a sacrificial priest' to ὁργεών or ὁργίων: in Hom. h. Apoll. Pyth. 211 we have οὐστωντας ἀνθρώπους ὁργίων εἰσαγάγοιτο: in a fragment of Antimachus (ἐνθα) Καβάρνοντος θῆκε ἀγακλέας ὁργίωνας<sup>2</sup>: and in Hermesianax (Ath. 597d) Hermann is evidently right in reading Ἀντίσπην, ἡ τε πολὺν μύστηριν Ἐλευνόνος παρὰ πέζαιν εὐαρμὸν κριψιών ἔξεφόρει λογίων, Πάριον ὁργεώνιον νόμῳ διαποιηνόνοσα Δήμητρα for ὁργανωνεμοι. From Phot. s.v. ὁργεών we learn that it was used by Aeschylus—in the Μυσοῖ, it may be noted—ποταμοῦ Καίκον χάρε πρῶτος ὁργεών, εὐχαῖς δὲ σφέσι δεσπότας παιωνίας, and that it also figured in the ἄξονες of Solon: from Harpoerion that there was a speech of Isaëus πρὸς τὸν ὁργεώνα and apparently that Theophrastus used it in his will (though it does not occur in it as given by Diog. Laert.). Doubtless also Lysias:—we are told, indeed, that he used ὁργέων as a genitive plural: Harpoer. Ὁργέων: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁργεώνων Λυτίας ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Θεοπόμπου κλήρου: Suid. p. 1150 Bernhardy 'Οργέων (sic): ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁργεώνων · Λυτίας: but the

<sup>1</sup> Lentz Herodian I p. 19, II p. 724. For forms in -άιν, -ήν see I 12 sqq., II 717 sqq., Lobeck *Parall.* 189 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Phot. s.v. ὁργεώνes p. 24 Naber, who says

'Codex ἀγακλέας ὁργίων': whence Suid. II p. 1150 has ἀβακλέας ὁργεώνας.

grammarian who originated this is generally held to have been deceived by a defective text (*Thes.*, Schmidt on Hesych. Ὁργέων: ἵερῶν ἢ ἱερέων). Though there does not appear anything *a priori* against ὁργέων, there is no record of it elsewhere, and certainly no one was less likely than Lysias to employ an unfamiliar form. Athenaeus, Harpoerion and Photius use the adjective ὁργεωνικός. As an Attic word, therefore, ὁργεών may be permitted to be oxytone; but when we find in Hesych. βοσκέων<sup>3</sup>: ὁ τροφέων, Liddell and Scott have no warrant for saying 'βοσκεών (not βοσκέων)', nor the editors generally for altering ἀλλα ξυνέων in Alexand. Aetol. v. 15 (Parthen. 14. 3).

Hesych. gives τιτήραι: βασιλέως. <Αἰσχύλος Φρυξίν> Ἑκτόρος λύτρος, and (τιτήρ by an error for) τιτήρη: ἡ βασιλισσα. I think if you compare Ἄλκμάν and Ἄλκμήρη it will be seen that Τιτήρη is merely a feminine of Τιτήρ or Τιτάν. He also gives τίταξ: ἔτρυος . ἡ δυνάστης. οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς: which is formed like νέαξ, πλούταξ and the like. In both these words the iota must be long; so that it was an unfortunate proposal of Hermann's (*Orysc.* v. 162) to read in Aesch. Cho. 398 τὰ χθονίων τίτηρα: I do not suppose that even χθονίων τίτηρα could have been said any more than χθονίων Τιτάνες.—Τιτώ, which was used by Lycophr. 941 and Callimachus (Tzetzes ad loc. cit.) for ἡμέρα or ἡώς (Schmidt on Hesych. iv p. 161), is of course a feminine ἴποκοριστικόν of Τιτάν as the Sun. Τιθωνός is explained as meaning ἡ ημέρα by Et. Mag. 758. 28 and Tzetz. on Lycophr. 18, and the Schol. on Hom. Al makes the same connexion as my comparative list had led me to infer: 'Ηώς δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγανοῖ Τιθωνόν] τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο νομιστέον ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥλιου ημέρα γέγονεν'. 'Τιθωνός δὲ ὥστε θέλει Τιτωνόν'. Τιτάν γάρ ὁ Απόλλων, ὅτι ἀπὸ Αγροῦς τοῦτον δὲ καὶ ἥλιον νεομίκαμεν. Whatever be the original meaning of the root (which I should look for in Iranian), I believe Τιτάν to be related to Τιθωνός as κουνάν to κουνέων.

If you wanted to form a verb from such a substantive as λυμέων, what would you make the termination? There was a choice of four: if you meant simply 'to be a λυμέων', you would make it -έω, as κουνάέω, κουνωέω, τελωνέω: if you meant rather 'to play the λυμέων', 'to act as such', you could choose between -εύω, -εύομαι (the middle was generally used), -έω, -έομαι or -άίω: often you find several of these terminations formed from the same substantive or adjective. But

<sup>3</sup> Not in the *Thesaurus*. Add to the Dictionaries ιδμάν Lentz Herodian. I p. 13, 32.

far the commonest was *-εύεσθαι*, and *λυμεωνέσθαι*<sup>1</sup> was used by Polyb. v. 5. 8 οὗτοι μὲν οὖν λυμεωνέμενοι τάῦτα καὶ τοιάντα συνεβούλενον. It may seem strange, but not to those who know something of the freedom with which these verbs were coined. This to the Thesaurus is merely 'the reading of several MSS. for λυμανόμενοι'—who finding λυμανόμενοι would write λυμεωνέμενοι?—while Liddell and Scott make it worse by adding *de suo* = λυμαίνομαι.' It is no more equivalent to λυμαίνομαι than χαριεντίζομαι to χαρίζομαι: λυμαίνομαι is transitive, while λυμεωνέμενοι and χαριεντίζομαι are intransitive and formed from λυμεών and χαριείς: and that is just the point which critics often, and the Dictionaries with them, fail to recognize. There will be room presently for another list.

In Meleager's epigram Stadtmueller ought to have accepted my correction ἀνεψεῖν. Jacobs, I find, had already proposed ἐφεψεῖν, but there was no reason for objecting to

<sup>1</sup> The Ionic (*προ*)λεσχηνεσθαι (Heraclit., Hippocr., Hdt.), implies a genitive λεσχηνος, though not necessarily a nominative λεσχην.

ἀνεψεῖν: in fact it was in illustrating the phrase ἀνεψικεν σοφά (Eur. *Jr.* 267, *Trag. fr. adesp.* 488, 509) that I made the correction originally. ἀνεψών cannot stand; we must in any case have had ἔγώ ὁ σοφά μούνος ἀνεψών, and φαμί cannot of course mean 'I speak.' The phrase as restored is of a common type, as when Parrhasios (Ath. 543c) asserts of himself εἰ καὶ ἄποστα κλύνονται, λέγω τάδε φαμί γάρ ηδη τέχνης εἰρῆσθαι τέρματα τῆσδε σαφῆ χειρὸς ὑψ' ἡμετέρης, ἀνυπέβλητος δὲ πεπηγεν οὐρος.

When giving a list before, of words like φίξα (C.R. xiv. p. 112), I ought to have corrected Hesychius ῥύζα: βία. ἡ τοῦ τόξου τάσις. It should be ῥύζα βιοῦ: ἡ τοῦ τόξου τάσις, as on the next page ῥύσιαν βολάν: τίνη τῶν τόξων τάσιν, like τόξον ῥύμα in the *Persae*. If he had given any other explanation, it would not have been βία but ὀλκή. For ἀρότον: τὸν ὀλκὸν τὸν Ἐκτόρος, ἢ τὸ ἀντίσταμον. Αἰσχύλος Φρυξί it will be evident from Hom. X 351 and the schol. (Nauk. p. 84) that we should read ἀροτόν or ἐροτόν.

W. HEADLAM.

### ELUCIDATIONS OF LATIN POETS.

#### III

##### HORACE EPODE XV 1—10.

Nox erat et caelo fulgebat luna sereno  
inter minora sidera,  
cum tu magnorum numen laesura deorum  
in umerba iurabas mea,  
artius atque hedera procera adstringitur  
ilex  
lentis adhaerens bracchis,  
dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion  
turbaret hibernum mare  
intonosque agitaret Apollinis aura ca-  
pillos,  
fore hunc amorem mutuum. 10

5

Since it is nonsense to say 'dum lupus turbaret mare,' the construction of 'dum pecori lupus' is commonly explained by the note 'scilicet *infestus esset*.' Such explanations are easier written with the hand than entertained in the head. For a wolf to cause storms at sea is doubtless difficult; but not more difficult than for the same adjective to serve as attribute to one noun and as predicate, with *esset* understood, to another. 'Prauissime' says Madvig 'primum ad *infestus* auditur *esset*, deinde idem adiectuum

sine *esset* cum Orione coniungitur, subiecto alio uerbo, quod nullo modo fieri potest.'

Bentley was too busy corrupting the tenses of the verbs to examine the construction of the sentence; and the only editors, so far as I know, who have seriously considered it are Peerlkamp, Lehrs, and Lucian Mueller. Peerlkamp, ever in chase of the spurious, ejected verses 8 and 9, the latter of which he did not understand: this leaves 'dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion, | fore hunc amorem mutuum,' an omission of *esset* without parallel in Horace, as Lucian Mueller has observed. Mueller himself writes 'man könnte das Ueberlieferete nothdürftig vertheidigen, wenn man hinter *Orion* interpongirte und zu u. 7 *esset* ergänzte. Dann stände *turbaret* intransitiv, wie Aen. vi 800 et *septem gemini turbant trepidi ostia Nili*, Lucr. ii 126 *corpora quae in solis radiis turbare uidentur* und sonst.....Allein die Auslassung von *esset* wäre sehr hart und ohne Beispiel bei Hor., auch wird man nur ungern u. 8 vom *Orion*, der zu Anfang des November untergeht (i 28 21), trennen.' Therefore he prefers the proposal of Lehrs, to assume the loss of two verses between *lupus* and *et nautis*, 'in der noch ein oder

en  
I v  
be  
ca  
bec  
mis  
7 a  
the  
par  
ow  
nas  
Sey  
qua  
Tha  
or th  
infie  
since  
to bla  
· alb  
fence  
pallo  
Ov  
uel  
a  
uel  
nunc  
qui  
Prof.  
shame  
or our  
surre  
public  
here v

zwei Beispiele von stets unveränderten Dingen erwähnt waren.'

What we have here is a brachylogy of that sort to which they have attached the name of zeugma. Aeschylus supp. 1006 sq. writes μὴ πάθωμεν ὅν πολὺς πόνος | πολὺς δὲ πόντος εἶνεκ' ηρόθη δορί, Euripides Ion 1064 sq. η θητὸν ἔξιφος η λαμῶν ἐξάψει βρόχον ἀμφὶ δειρήν, Pindar Pyth. iv 185 sq. οὐτέ ἐργον οὐτέ ἔπος ἐκτράπελον κείνουσα εἰπών, Virgil georg. i 92 sq. 'ne tenues pluriae rapidue potentia solis | acerit aut Boreae penetrabile frigus adurat,' Cicero ad Att. x 4 4 'fortunam, qua illi florentissima, nos duriore conflictati uidemur'; and the meaning of Horace's words is the following: 'dum lupus pecori infestus (terraret ovilā, or what you will,) et Orion nautis infestus turbaret hibernum mare.'

I think the examples quoted above are enough to establish this interpretation; but I will further cite the following instances, because they are even more licentious, because one of the boldest is Horace's, and because the others are either neglected or misunderstood. They differ from epod. xv 7 and resemble Cic. ad Att. x 4 4 in that the notion omitted is rather opposite than parallel to the notion expressed.

The first occurs in a context very like our own: Sen. Herc. Oet. 335-8.

ante ab occasu dies  
nascetur, Indos ante glacialis polus  
Scythasue tepida Phoebus inficiet rota,  
quam me relictam Thessalae aspiciant nurus.

That is 'Indos glacialis polus (*refrigerabit* or the like) Scythasue Phoebus tepida rota inficiet.' It will not do to supply *inficiet*, since *inficere* unqualified does not mean to *bleach* and does mean *to tan*. Horace says 'albus ora pallor inficit,' but that is no defence of 'polus Indos inficiet' for 'inficiet pallore.'

Ovid her. xix 171-4.  
uel pudor hic utinam, qui nos clam cogit  
amare,  
uel timidus famae cedere uellet amor.  
nunc male res iuinctae, calor et reuerentia,  
pugnant:  
quid sequar in dubio est: haec decet, ille  
iuuat.

Prof. Purser translates 'would that this shame which now compels us to a secret love, or our too fearful love could bring itself to surrender and be known (lit. surrender to publicity)', words which seem neither to cohere with the context nor to make sense in

themselves nor to be reconcilable with the Latin: how can *famae cedere* mean 'surrender to publicity'? how can *utinam pudor famae cedere uellet* mean anything at all? and when Hero wishes 'that her shame could bring itself to be known' has her language any thought behind it? The sense required is 'would that love would vanquish shame or shame would vanquish love; instead of which they now wage an equal conflict, and I know not which to obey': no other meaning will be tolerable, and if the words do not contain it they must be altered till they do. Bentley therefore proposed 'uel pudor hic utinam, qui nos clam cogit, *amori*, | uel' etc.; but 'clam cogit' alone has no fit sense. The construction of the text is 'utinam uel pudor, qui nos clam amare cogit, (*amori cedere uellet*), uel amor famae (*i.e.* pudori).' *fama* means good reputation, honest name, as in *amor*. iii 14 36 'si dubitas famae parcere, parce mihi,' and stands for the same thing as *pudor* in 171 and *reuerentia* in 173: *calor* in 173 is identical with *amor* in 172.

Hor. serm. ii 2 11-13.

seu pila uelox

molliter austерum studio fallente labore, seu te discus agit, pete cedentem aera disco.

That is, as Lambinus explained, 'seu pila te agit, (*lude pila*), seu discus, pete aera disco'. Similar, but much easier, is epist. i 3 23-5 'seu linguam causis acuis, seu ciuica iura | respondere para, seu condis amabile carmen, | prima feres hederae uictricis praemia', where 'feres hederae praemia' is the apodosis only to the third of the three protases, for ivy is not the meed of causidici and iurisconsulti.

Lucan vii 320-5.

sed, dum tela micant, non uos pietatis imago ulla nec aduersa conspecti fronte parentes commoueant: uoltus gladio turbate ueren-  
dos.

sive quis infesto cognata in pectora ferro  
ibit, seu nullum uiolabit uolnere pignus,  
ignoti iugulum tamquam scelus imputet  
hostis.

That is 'sive quis in cognatum ibit, (*scelus imputet*), sive in non cognatum, huius caudem imputet tamquam scelus': *imputo* as in Suet. Ner. 36 'coniurati . . . dixerit causam, cum quidam ultra crimen fatenterunt, nonnulli etiam *imputarent* ('claimed credit for it'), tamquam aliter illi non possent nisi morte succurrere dedecorato flagitiis *omnibus*'. Caesar is urging his soldiers to spare no enemy who faces them: 'if you strike a

kinsman, count the crime a distinguished service; if one who is no kinsman, count the deed a service no less distinguished than if it were a crime like the other.' Parricide committed on Caesar's behalf will naturally constitute a claim on Caesar's gratitude, and he further promises to regard the killing of any Pompeian as no less meritorious than parricide.

It is not likely that such things could happen in formal prose; and I do not defend the MSS., for instance, at Liu. xxx 4 5 'proinde, seu ipsi stare iam sententia, <promeret>, seu consulendus Hasdrubal et Carthaginenses essent, consuleret', or Cic. pro Sex. Rosc. 22 'cum eodem tempore et ea, quae praeterita sunt, <sanet> et ea, quae uidetur instare, praeparet'.

Now listen to the fashionable commentator Kiessling, for whom the multitude have deserted their old favourite Orelli.

*infestus sc. foret gehört ἀπὸ κούνοι auch zu *lupus*, aber die ursprünglich als Attribut gewollte Bestimmung qui *turbal hibernum mare* ist um des Parallelismus mit dem folgenden agitaret aurea willen zum Prädikat geworden, und hat dadurch ein leises Anakoluth bewirkt.*

This fabulous narrative is a specimen of the 'sympathetic exegesis' which is supposed to have arisen in the last twenty years of the

19th century; though in point of fact it flourished high at the century's beginning in Cicero's philosophical works, amidst great though temporary applause, under the auspices of Goerenz. The engine was invented to protect corrupt passages from correction: let a text be impeached as bad grammar or nonsense, and the commentator instantly overflows with fictitious details of the disorder which he alleges to have existed in the author's mind: they may seem incredible, they may lack all confirmation, but he is a sympathetic interpreter and you disbelieve him at your peril. This practice of concocting fictions at a moment's notice, instead of stopping and thinking, or trying to think, is naturally attended with a certain amount of moral and intellectual damage; and often when the sympathetic interpreter arrives at a passage which is not corrupt, but only difficult, and which really wants interpreting, the event proves that his bad habit has crippled his powers of interpretation. Instead of probing the difficulty to find its solution, he resorts to the easier and more familiar expedient of smothering it under a cascade of figments; and the office of interpreter devolves upon the unsympathetic.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### VINDICIAE PROPERTIANAE.—II.

(Continued from p. 44.)

I PASS to places where my readings have been criticised through their having been wholly or partially misconceived.

I begin with a re-punctuation:

II xxii. 17 sq.

uni cuique dedit uitium natura: creato  
mi fortuna aliud semper amare dedit.

I understand this passage, and have always understood it, in the same sense as my critic, as meaning that every man is born with some frailty, and that the congenital frailty of Propertius is to be always in love. Accordingly I am concerned with nothing but the observation that 'otherwise [viz. unless I adopt an interpretation which is clearly incorrect] the change is aimless.' Strictly speaking there is no change; for the vulgate punctuation of Propertius has no warrant in tradition, and we are free in all respects to punctuate as the sense requires. Nor is

it aimless. That *fortuna* and *natura* may in this connexion have the same sense of 'destiny' is well known and may be proved from authors nearer to Propertius than Seneca; e.g. Lucretius 5. 77 'expediam qua uiflectat *natura* gubernans' and not a page off 'quod procul a nobis flectat *fortuna* gubernans' (107). But when we have the choice, it seems better to allow *creato* to go with *fortuna* whose sense it helps to determine than with *natura*, which certainly stands in no need of its support (Lucr. ib. 871 'at quis nil horum *tribuit natura*'). The pause after the last trochee is quite Propertian. Turning over the pages of this second book my eye lights on viii. 15 'uisus? an usque,' xxviii 9 'Venus ipsa? peraeque.'

The second re-punctuation which is regarded as detrimental is that of III xi. 34, to which I refer here because of the important principle which its consideration

im  
cr  
pr  
ti  
  
at  
thu  
ubi  
Ph  
of s  
and  
Por  
cite  
to  
not  
The  
its  
star  
whi  
rem  
har  
caus  
nor

bet  
mon  
late  
upo  
'Bi  
'pon  
do.  
wou  
The  
kind  
as fo

N  
T  
N  
Or to

Bu

Fri

W  
or 'E  
raatrō  
back

duci

WI  
would  
I con

1 A

2 Th

involves. For the same reason I quote the criticism in full, with the note from the *praefatio* (to the separate edition of Propertius) to which it refers.

"At putide *tres—una* inter se opponuntur"—  
immo, si uis, putidissime modo poetae cum Graeci  
tum Romani totiens in hunc modum numeris  
luiserint, modo Propertius ipse ita dixerit "*una*  
d e c m uic t missa sagitta rates."—Praef. p. vi.

"The second change of stops to which I referred is at III xi. 34 sqq. where Dr. Postgate punctuates thus: 'totiens nostro Memphi cruenta malo, | tres ubi Pompeio detraxit harena triumphos | una ; Philippeo' et cetera. What then is the normal number of shores required to rob a man of three triumphs? and how many places would you have expected Pompey to die in? Dr. Postgate in praef. p. vi. cites IV vi. 68 'una decem uicit missa sagitta rates' to justify the antithesis of *tres* and *una*. There is nothing absurd in the antithesis of *tres* and *una*. The numerals do indeed create the antithesis, but its absurdity resides not in them but in the substantives, which are the names of things between which no antithesis is conceivable. And even if you removed the antithesis by removing *tres*, *una* *harena* would still remain intrinsically absurd, because a man cannot be assassinated on two shores nor be 'robbed of his triumphs' piecemeal."

Now there is a strong family resemblance between this criticism and those of the immortal Lord Dundreary (a creation of the late Mr. Sothern not yet, I hope, forgotten) upon certain of our English proverbs. '*Birds of a feather | Flock together.* Absurd, 'pon my word. *Flock together*; of course they do. It would be a dashed silly bird that would go and flock in a corner by itself!' The same treatment may be applied to any kind of literature with interesting results, as for example to the following :

Now, of my threescore years and ten,  
*Twenty* will not come again.<sup>1</sup>

No more will the 'fifty' for that matter.  
Or to the following :

Buoyed on the heaven-heard whisper  
Of dancing leaflets whirled  
From all the woods that autumn  
Bereaves in all the world.<sup>2</sup>

Why not 'From all woods in the world,' or 'From the woods in all the world'? *δις ταῦτον ἡμῖν εἴτεν ὁ σοφός* — Or, to come back to Propertius (III xv. 39 sq.)

tibi gloria Dirce  
ducitur, *in multis* mortem habitura locis.

Why not ask 'and how many places would you have expected Dirce to die in?' I confess that in all these cases my own

sympathies would be with the poet rather than the critic.

The criticism appears to consist of two parts, of which the first is that 'the substantives are the names of two things between which no antithesis is conceivable.' Then I suppose that the statement 'reportauit tres triumphos ex una harena' of a general who gained triumphs by conquering three times on the same shore, would involve an inconceivable antithesis. The second count is that the statement attributed to Propertius is 'intrinsically absurd.' To this it will be, I imagine, answer enough to show, firstly, that, if by 'intrinsic' we understand literal absurdity, intrinsically absurd expressions abound in language and literature; secondly, that, if we regard the meaning intended, this, whatever else it may be, is by no means absurd; and thirdly, that the 'absurdity,' such as it is, may be explained if it cannot be justified. With the first point I have already dealt in part. I will, however, add some words translated from an excellent little book,<sup>3</sup> published since the criticism was penned, and which have a special relevance to the passage before us. 'It is not only quite natural psychologically that a man in passionate excitement should use strong words, even when they run counter to his object; but it is also psychologically quite true and established by experience that the stronger his language the stronger is the effect upon his hearers, who consider far less *what* is said than with what force and to what end it is said.' Now this poem of Propertius, which deals with the saving of Rome from Cleopatra, is pitched throughout in a high key of excitement; and more than one expression in it might be blamed as literally 'absurd.' Let verse 44 [ausa] 'baridos et contis rostra Liburna sequi' serve as an example. Cleopatra we know from Horace 'dementis ruinas funus et imperio parabat.' But no one has ever supposed her so 'demented' as to have pursued Liburnian gallies with Nile barges. Secondly, the thought is not absurd, unless cavil make it so. 'One day,' says the poet, 'stripped Pompey of all his glories:' the glories of Pompey being symbolized by the three triumphs which to Roman eyes were the most striking feature of his career (cf. Cicero de diuin. 2. § 22, Velleius 2. 53. 3, Lucan 8. 814, Petronius 123 v. 240 and elsewhere) and the day of his death symbolized by the shore on which was left his headless corse: 'iacet ingens litore truncus.' And it is Proper-

<sup>1</sup> A Shropshire Lad (II). The italics are mine.

<sup>2</sup> The same (XLII). The italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> F. Polle *Wie denkt das Volk ueber die Sprache?*  
2nd ed., 1898 p. 26.

tian; II. xi. 3 sq. *omnia*, 'crede mihi, tecum uno munera lecto | auferet extremi funeris atra dies' upon which it might be asked 'what was the normal number of biers required to carry all the charms of Cynthia?' Lastly, it is not difficult to assign the reason why it would not have occurred to Propertius that the phrase is 'intrinsically absurd.' For some reason or other numbers and their relations have long had a strange fascination for the human mind. In the case of the ancients this fancy often issued in antitheses which seem somewhat inept or inane to us, because we have lost the feeling which informed them. This I called in my *praefatio* 'playing with numbers' and illustrated by the triling opposition of *una* to *decem* in the poem upon Actium. But more noticeable instances can be produced. I will cite one. Of the elegies of Propertius' predecessor Cornelius Gallus, one pentameter alone survives. It describes how the Hypensis of Scythia separates Europe from Asia; 'uno tellures diuidit amne duas.' Now unless we are prepared to maintain that it requires more than one diameter to divide a circle into two, or more than one diagonal to bisect a parallelogram, we must admit that, from our point of view, the antithesis in 'one river dividing two continents' is destitute of significance.

### III. ix. 37 sq.

non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse paternos  
Cadmi nec semper proelia clade pari.

Here for *paternos* I read *repentes* which is characterised as 'a useless epithet and a form not known to exist.' Whether '*repenti* fulminis ictu' in Lucretius (5. 400) is a sufficient warrant for the acc. plur. is a question I would leave to the reader;<sup>1</sup> but my citation should have saved the adjective from the reproach of 'uselessness.' I understand the passage, as I understood it in my *Select Elegies of Propertius*, to allude to the destruction of the royal palace at the birth of Dionysus and the death of Semele. I there compared Stat. Theb. 3. 183 sqq. 'ueteris cum regia Cadmi | fulmineum in cinerem monitis Iunonis iniquis | consedit' (cf. ib. 10. 902 sqq. quoted in the same place). So far then from my epithet being useless, it is

<sup>1</sup> The same reader will doubtless be able to determine whether it is a satisfactory interpretation of the text to say it refers to the sack of Thebes by the *epigoni* and that the falling fortress is supposed to blend its ashes with those of its former defenders, as soon as he has succeeded in unravelling the relationship between the *cineres* and the other assumed actors in the scene.

absolutely necessary to fix the allusion. It is their 'suddenness' which distinguishes the ashes caused by the lightning-stroke from the ashes of the burning town.

The extent of the influence of Lucretius upon Propertius is an interesting subject upon which I could wish I had the space to enlarge. I have come to think it greater than I did formerly. My emendation of IV i. 57 (which Mr. Housman has commended) owes a good deal of its probability for me to the parallel of Lucr. 1. 47. In this very poem (III ix) verse 7 and possibly verse 5 ('quod nequeas') seem to me unlike Propertius in expression and reminiscent of Lucretian phraseology 6. 959 sqq. 'non omnia . . . relbus sint omnibus apta, 5. 543-5, 5. 836 'quod potuit nequit ut nequeat quod non tulit ante.' Mr. Nairn in this journal (1899 p. 393) has recently defended Jacob's conjecture at III vii. 46 'in terra nil ubi flare potest,' by what he rightly calls a remarkable parallel from Lucretius 6. 138 sqq. The chief objection which I felt to this conjecture, that the use of the infinitive is strange to Propertius, obviously loses much of its force if Propertius is imitating Lucretius with whom such infinitives are very common.

I proceed to another passage where the question of literary borrowing or reminiscence is involved:

### III. xvii. 1 sq.

nunc, o Bacche, tuis humiles aduoluimur  
aris:  
da mihi placatus uela secunda pater.

The MSS. have here *pacato* which it is proposed to take as 'tranquillized.' I have no objection to this if it can be got out of the Latin. But no parallel is forthcoming (for III. xiii. 25 can hardly count). *Pacata mente* Lucr. and the like I know: but they are not near enough. If *pacato* could be the abl. of *pacatum*, the text might stand. I do not expect however any one to maintain this. There is additional awkwardness in having *pacatus* in agreement with *mihi*: it more properly refers to the stilled sea (*pax maris*, Lucan) and winds (Lucr. 5. 1230 'uentorum paces animasque secundas'). It is urged however that to remove the idea of tranquillizing from the second line will be 'positively harmful.' How this can be maintained I cannot see. Propertius first addresses the god of wine in all humility and desires his favour (verses 1, 2): in the next three lines he explains how Bacchus might help him, and in v. 6 he prefers his

special request 'tu uitium ex animo dilue, Bacche, meo.' Why should it be said that v. 2 must anticipate v. 6?

My conjecture *placatus*, the palaeographical facility of which is not contested, was based upon the belief that Ovid in Fasti 3, 789 sq. and its vicinity, as in countless other places, had Propertius in his mind. The subject of both passages is the same,—namely Bacchus, though the main topic is not. The particular exploits of the god which Propertius says he will sing of on some future occasion and which Ovid says he can not sing of now, are more or less the same. Bacchus' wonderful birth, his Indian conquests, his destruction of Pentheus, of Lycurgus, his transformation of the pirates into porpoises are referred to by both poets in their most characteristic styles. The couplet which I cited from Ovid is the following 'mite caput, pater, hue placataque cornua uertas | et des ingenio uela secunda meo.' It contains three verbal coincidences with the couplet and poem which we are considering: *pater*—*uela secunda*—*cornua* Prop. v. 19 'per te et tua cornua uiuam.' The similarity seemed to me too great to be the work of accident, and I considered it in accordance with critical method to emend the *pacato* of Propertius' manuscripts by the aid of the *placata* of Ovid's text. But it is objected that if the passage shows that Propertius wrote *placatus*, 'it also shows that he wrote *mitis*.' And in the same way it shows that he wrote *caput* and *que* and *uertas* and *et* and *des* and in fact that he was the author of Ovid, Fast. 3. 715 onward.

I pass on to another couplet in the same poem:

*ib.* 17 sq.

dum modo purpureo . . mihi dolia musto  
et noua pressantis inquiet uua pedes.

For the missing word the MSS. have either *numen* (N, DV) or what appears to be an abbreviation of *numine* (F, correctly reported by Baehrens) or *numere* (L partly in erasure): the editors with rare unanimity import into the text the old conjecture *spument*. Now in accordance with a canon of critical method which was laid down in the first of these papers, no emendation of a text can be accepted unless there is evidence that the confusions or corruptions which it postulates are elsewhere attested for the history of that text; and since in the case of *spument* there is no such evidence forthcoming, that emendation must

pass for what it is, a licentious alteration. The palaeographical considerations adduced in my monograph 'On Certain Manuscripts of Propertius' p. 41 were of sufficient force to convince the late Professor Palmer who had previously printed *spument* in his text. Palmer's own suggestion, never published, I believe, was *manent*, very near to the letters but failing to give the sense required. In the monograph referred to I wrote, too generously, of *spument* that it gave an 'excellent sense.' It does not. Propertius promises to honour Bacchus by cultivating his cherished trees, provided (the stipulation is humorous) a satisfactory vintage makes it worth his while. This *spument* does not express. All must 'foams' in the vat, whether a gallon or a tun. Hence when a Latin writer uses *spumare* of a vintage such as Propertius here desires, he adds words that make his meaning clear; Virg. G. 2. 6 '*spumat plenis uindemia labris*,' Columella de re rustica 10. 431 sq. '*ferueat ut lacus et multo completa Falerno*—*exundent pingui spumantia dolia musto*', to which we may also add Manilius 3. 662 sq. Hence Ovid says Trist. 3. 10. 71 sq. 'non hic pampinea dulcis latet uua sub umbra | nec cumulant altos feruida musta lacus' and the author of the Aetna 271 '*horrea uti saturata et tumeant ut dolea musto*' To give this sense I conjectured *cumulet* which appeared best to satisfy the indications of the MSS.: but the first person stands in need of some apology and perhaps we should read *cumulet*, the subject being the 'grapes' of the next line. It is however possible that we should restore *tumeant* from the Aetna whose author seems to have been acquainted with Propertius.<sup>1</sup>

III xiii. 39 sq.

*corniger atque dei uacuam pastoris in aulam  
dux aries saturas ipse reduxit oves.*

Very likely I was hasty in assuming that Apollo tended the flocks of Admetus as well as his herds, and in objecting to the position of *corniger* and the position of *atque*. But I would claim that my correction was at the least an attempt to give some coherence to the passage, whose connexion with its context I will now proceed to indicate. Propertius is singing of a happy golden age when the relations of gods and mortals were more intimate than at present, and *more suo* he gives his subject an erotic turn. He

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was printed, I find *tumeant* in Prof. J. S. Philimore's just published text of Propertius and the reference to the Aetna in his note.

speaks first of goddesses 'nec fuerat nudas  
poena uidere deas' thinking perhaps of the  
shepherds Anchises and Paris: and then  
he turns to gods. In those days they loved  
mortals and shepherded flocks and in the  
absorption of their passion forgot when  
the night drew in and it was time to drive  
their charges home. Compare the oblivion  
of his proper task which Love induces in  
the Cyclops Theor. Id. 11. 12 πολλάκι ταὶ  
δῖες ποτὶ τώλιον αὐταὶ ἀπῆνθον | χλωρᾶς  
ἐκ βοτάνας, ὁ δὲ τὰν Γαλάτειαν ἀείδων | αὐτεὶ ἐπ'  
ἀνόνος κατετάκητο φυκοεστάς. It is to some  
such legend as that of Apollo and Admetus  
that Propertius must here allude.

IV x. 43 sq.

illi virgatis iaculantis ab agmine bracis  
torquis ab incisa decidit unca gula.

For the first time an interpretation of the text has been given which is consistent with Latinity. For whether we like it or not, we must admit Mr. Housman's construction of *illi* as a sort of dat. of the agent with *decidit* to be linguistically possible. Unfortunately this is not enough; and to say that there is a difficulty in *virgatis*—*bracis*, a not so very extraordinary instance of the Propertian ablative, while allowing none in *ab agmine* is to strain off the gnat and gulp down the camel. This phrase must mean that 'he hurls' or 'poises his javelin' or whatever else *iaculantis* may mean, *from the ranks*, just as in Virg. Aen. 9. 375 'conclamat *ab agmine* Volscens.' Now this Gaulish chieftain was not in the ranks: for the combat was a *μονομαχία* and took place in front of the armies. It appears necessary to print again the passage of Plutarch Marcellus 7, which describes the scene: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ κατιδὼν ὁ τῶν Γαλατῶν βασιλεὺς καὶ τεκμηράμενος ἀπὸ τῶν συμβόλων ἀρχοντα τοῖστον εἶναι, πολὺν πρὸ τῶν ἀλλων ἐξελέασας τὸν ἵππον, ἦρα τὴν φωνὴν προκλητικὸν ἐπαλαλάζων καὶ τὸ δόρυ κραδαίνων κτλ. In order then that *ab agmine* may attain the sense desired, a verb of motion is required, such as we have in Ov. Fast. 4. 313 'haec ubi castarum processit *ab agmine* matrum' and this my *iaculans* it supplies. I do not deny that *ab* may mean '(being) away from,' but that it can mean it here.

Certain of my emendations were defended at the time of making in a paper read before the Cambridge Philological Society. The paper has never been published; and so I repeat as much of it as is relevant here,

shortening where possible and omitting references to derelict conjectures.

I ii. 9–14.

aspice quos submittat humus [formosa] colores,  
ut ueniant hederae sponte sua melius,  
surgat et in solis formosius arbutus antris,  
et sciat indociles currere lympha uias.  
litora natuui [persuadent] picta lapillis  
et uolucres nulla dulcior arte canunt.

The text of these lines, addressed to Cynthia who is too fond of adorning her person, is 'Nature cannot be improved upon.' The theme is capable of two slightly different expressions. The perfection may be absolute or comparative. Nature's work is consummate; or it is better than the work of Art. 'How beautiful is the flower-strown ground—the running stream.' Again, 'The ivy grows better wild—so does the arbutus. Wild birds sing sweeter than tame.' The sense of line 13 might then be either the sea shore of nature is very beautiful, or it is more beautiful than that of Art. We shall reckon it in favour of the first view that the arrangement of the passage suggests it. Absence of the comparative in 9, its presence in 10 and then in 11, its absence in 12 and then in 13, and its presence again in 14 gives the chiastic order so dear to the Roman writer.<sup>1</sup> A stronger argument is the dismal failure of the attempts to introduce the second view by giving *picta* its literal meaning, 'in pictures,' the first and worst of which was Kindschner's 'restinguunt.' These all separate *picta* from *litora* in order to obtain an accusative, 'natural pebble-strown shores are superior to painted ones'—in itself enough to condemn them. But this is not all. The thought so introduced is irrelevant. Propertius is speaking not of imitations but of improvements of nature. He does not mean that Cynthia's face should not be painted in the studio, but in the dressing room. Once more *picta* appears to be fixed to the metaphorical sense by the parallels of Ovid (Amores 2. 11. 13 sq.) 'nec medius tenuis conchas pictosque lapillos pontus habet: bibuli litoris illa mora est,' and Lucretius (2. 374 sqq.) 'concharumque genus parili ratione uidemus | pingere teluris gremium qua mollibus undis | litoris incurui bibulam pauit aequor harenam.'

It is clear then that with the majority of Propertian critics we should construe *picta* with *natuui lapillis* and seek in *persuadent*

<sup>1</sup> A noteworthy example is Lucr. 6. 601 sqq. Compare my remarks in the Journal of Philology, vol. 24, p. 146 note.

some verb meaning 'are brilliant' or the like. The two best conjectures hitherto proposed are Hertzberg's *praelucent* and Baehrens' *praefulgent*, which would both be best understood to mean 'shine on their edge' or marge. It was the palaeographical improbability of these conjectures which led me to propose *resplendent*; *resplendent* was confused with *respondent*: cf. Manilius 5. 720, Dirae 40. And *persuadent* is simply '*respondent* with two constant confusions ( $e=a$ ,  $n=u$ ) and the letters transposed.

Hertzberg urges the appropriateness of *prae-*; we may with equal justice press the claims of *re-*. Compare Aen. 12. 741 'fulua resplendent fragmina harena' and the 'reslucentis calculos' of the Clitumnus Plin. Ep. 8. 2.

#### I. v. 7

non est illa uagis similis collata puellis,  
molliter irasci non sciet illa tibi.  
quod si forte tuis non est contraria notis  
at tibi curarum milia quanta dabit!

For 'collata' O N has 'conlata' which in any case is nearer to the truth. But this participle is justly suspected. We want to be told under what circumstances Cynthia is unlike women of the town, not that she is unlike them if compared. The sense required is that of II. 34. 9 'Lynceu, tune meam potuisti perfide curam | tangere? nonne tuae tum cecidere manus?' And it is given by the slight change 'contacta', a sense of the word for which compare Ov. Trist. 2. 252 'equid ab hac omnes rigide summouimus Arte, | quas stola contingi uitatta sumpta uetat?' It is to be observed that 'collata' has occurred 26 lines before, in the same part of the verse.

#### I. xii. 9 sq.

inuidiae fuimus? num me deus obruit, an  
quaes  
lecta Prometheis diuidit herba iugis?

The palaeographical superiority of my *diuidis* (the MS. variants are *diuidit* and *diuitis*) is admitted. In point of sense it has no less the advantage. For with the second person *herba* advances a step towards personification, and thus forms a better antithesis to the personal *deus*. Not only so; but the harshness of the use of the verb in the sense of 'causes division' is mitigated to a certain extent. The apostrophe of the inanimate is a phenomenon far from rare in Latin poetry. Sometimes it is appropriate, sometimes, at least

from our point of view, it is not. Here, I think, it is as appropriate as in III. vii. 26 'Paetum sponte tua uilis harena tegas' where the third person would have fitted the metre just as well.

In the confessedly corrupt passage II. xxxiv. 13-16.

tu mihi uel ferro pectus uel perde ueneno :  
a domina tantum te modo tolle modo.  
te socium uitae, te corporis esse licebit  
te dominum admitto rebus, amice, meis.

I transposed the similar substantives in 13 and 15 reading *corpus*, *pectoris*. It is said that *pectus* is better in the first line. I must demur. If *ferro* had stood alone, this might be allowed, but *ueneno* follows, with which *pectus* agrees less well. The proper antithesis in this connexion to my *mistress* is *myself*, and it is well known to Latin scholars that *corpus* often does duty as a stronger *se*. I need not labour this point. The appropriateness of 'socium pectoris' is not challenged. So I will just note as more or less close parallels for the idea Ovid Tr. 4. 4. 72, Manilius 2. 630, Stat. Theb. 2. 364.

On Mr. Housman's own proposal to interchange *socium* and *dominum* in the second couplet, I need at present only say this, that I cannot accept it on the ground that it would bring *socium* too near to the *socium* that I believe must be read in 17, my note upon which I will now transcribe.

#### II. xxxiv. 17 sq.

lecto te solum, lecto te deprecor uno ;  
riualem possum non ego ferre Iouem.

The only comment on 17 that I know is Paley's 'You are the only man I would refuse, and the only thing I would refuse you is my Cynthia.' The English translator apparently takes *solum* as an adverb and wisely omits it 'from my mistress, my mistress only I beg you to keep away.' This translation reveals another phenomenon, *deprecor* constructed with the ablative. It is not wonderful that Heinsius proposed *delecto*, though that too is unexampled. The *sense* is clear from 18 'I cannot bear the rivalry of Jove:' the word is coupled with *riualis* by Catullus 579 'riuales socii puerularum' if we accept the most natural interpretation. Such rival-partners, says Propertius, in Cynthia's favours, he and Lynceus can never be. 'te socium' for 'tuam societatem' resembles in its fate 'ego nupta' for 'meae nuptiae' IV. 4. 59 which had disappeared from the text of Propertius till Baehrens restored it after Luetjohann. The same sense and use, with

no pronoun inserted, occurs in Seneca Ag. 696 'aerumnae meae | socium recusant.' The change is of the slightest; *socius* is frequently written *sotius* in our MSS. and *t*, *i* and *l* are continually being confused. *Lecto* is dative as in the passages of Ennius cited by Gellius VII. (VI.) 16. 9, 10 'quibus seruitutem mea miseria deprecor' 'ego meae cum uitiae parcam, letum inimico deprecor.' In the present case the failure to observe this construction has protected a Propertian form of the dative 'uno' from the assaults of conjecture. [I append the note in Rothstein's commentary '17 *Deprecari* wird in dieser Bedeutung mit einem abstrakten Objekt verbunden; am Stelle von *te deprecor* kann man sich etwa *tuam societatem deprecor* denken, aber gerade durch die Vermeidung des Abstrakts gewinnt der Ausdruck an Kraft.' This is an excellent note upon *te socium*; but, alas, the text has *te solum*.]

On two places which could not be treated shortly, viz. II. xxxii. 33-40 and III. xix. 19 sq., I have already said all I need elsewhere, in the American Journal of Philology vol. 17 pp. 30-44 and *ib.* vol. 18 pp. 74 sq. 'On the alleged confusion of Nymph names with especial reference to Propertius I. 21 and II 32. 40.'

I have sometimes been asked the meaning of my correction in IV. i. 33.

quippe suburbanae parua nimis urbe  
Bouillae  
et, qui nunc nulli, maxima turba Gabi.

My *nimis* is of course to be taken with *suburbanae*. Bouillae was too close to the city when the city was young. Propertius extracts a point from an adjective which seems to have been a sort of standing epithet of Bouillae. The 'dangerous proximity' here meant may be illustrated from Aristophanes Nubes 214 sqq. Στρ. ἀλλ' ἡ Λακέδαιμον ποῦ ὄτιν; Μα. ὅπον ὄτιν;  
αἴτη. | Στρ. ὁσὲ ἐγγὺς ἡμῶν. τοῦτο νῦν φρονίζετε, | ταΐτην ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀπαγαγεῖν πόρρω πάν. Compare also the expression in Virgil's celebrated 'Mantua uae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae' Ecl. 9. 28.

I consider in conclusion a place which I left only half-emeuded in my text, but have since corrected<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. ii. 35 sqq.

est mea et aurigae species cum uerbere, et  
eius  
traicit alterno qui leue pondus equo,

suppetat hoc: pisces calamo praedabor et  
ibo  
mundus demissis institor in tunicis.

The MSS. have 'est etiam aurigae species uertumnus et,' and the vulgate has a full stop after *equo*.

The signs of corruption in this passage are very obvious as soon as it is closely scanned. In the first place we have the extraordinary statement that *Vertumnus* is 'a form of an *auriga* and also of a *desultor*.' If *Vertumnus* is regarded as the proper name, the statement is meaningless: if it be a common name, the assertion that certain kinds of *aurigae* and *desultores* were named *uertumni* stands in sad need of corroboration. In either case it is wholly irrelevant to the context as will presently appear. But there is yet another difficulty. Everyone must have felt the clumsiness of the vulgate text of 37, 'suppetat hoc pisces calamo praedabor.' The last three words express the meaning briefly but perfectly; and what purpose do 'suppetat hoc' serve? We may get rid of the difficulty in the form *hoc* by accepting Heinsius' *hic*; but then we have to explain why Propertius, meaning 'suppetat calamus, hoc pisces praedabor' or 'suppetat hic calamus, pisces pr.', should have chosen to write what he has: and the superfluity still remains.

Now the text of *Vertumnus'* address to the poet is given in 21 'opportuna mea est cunctis natura figuris' and it is developed beyond possibility of mistake in the following distichs. 'In the *Coa uestis*' he says 'I shall appear as a light o' love, in the *toga* as a man, as a haymaker with a sickle in my hand: I once wore armour, and was a fine military figure, with a basket on my head a manifest harvester.' And so on (25-34). Not only does the context that precedes our four lines speak so clearly, but what follows is equally plain: 'with a staff I shall play shepherd, and with a flower basket I shall be taken for a rose-seller,' and, to go back to the last of our couplets, 'with a rod I shall be a fisherman and in a loose tunic a spruce commis voyageur.' It is clear then that the sense of our passage must be this. 'With the outward sign of a driver I shall be an *auriga* and with the outward sign of a *circus rider* a *desultor*.' These outward signs are not on the surface of the traditional text at present, but they are not far below it. To take the *desultor* first, 'suppetat hoc' will supply his characteristic emblem without the change of a letter: we have only to make the not very audacious assumption that *hoc* is used

<sup>1</sup> See *Classical Review* for 1897 p. 405.

*δεικτικῶς* 'this object.' The object referred to I think must be the *pilleus* or felt cap which Hyginus Fab. 80 assigns to the *desulor* and with which he is invariably represented in works of art. Some may dislike the pause after the second arsis of the hexameter. But Propertius uses it elsewhere in the fourth book of his elegies, viii. 69, x. 41. I pass on to the charioteer. His sign may be extracted from the unintelligible *vertumnus*; the driver must be accompanied with his *whip*, *cum uerbere*; *uerber* as in Ovid Met. 14. 821 'conceddit equos Gradius et iactu | uerberis increpuit.' It is easy to see how this corruption arose: in the letters *cum uer<ber>e t* was written for *c* and the last

of the two similar syllables omitted. The resulting *tum uer* suggested, in this context inevitably, the metrical stop-gap *vertumnus*. To Mr. Housman belongs the credit of having first suspected the vapid 'est etiam.' His suggested remedy was *mentiar*. But my correction 'est mea et' does not change a single letter except the commonly confused *e* and *i*, and it has the advantage of not making *species* a plural. The distich means then: 'My appearance is also that of the charioteer when I have whip in hand and of a circus rider if I am supplied with this.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

#### THE NEW 'CODEX OPTIMUS' OF MARTIAL

THE twelfth-century MS. (L), recently acquired by the Royal Library, Berlin (lat. fol. 612) from Lucca, is older by a considerable interval than the other MSS. which exhibit the better text of Martial, a text that can be traced to the recension or edition published by Torquatus Gennadius in 401 A.D. It is therefore worth while to examine the peculiar features of this 'codex optimus' with sufficient minuteness to discover what light it can throw on the archetype of this family, technically known as the B<sup>A</sup> family, of our MSS. of Martial (see p. 309 of this year's volume of the *Classical Review*).

Were it not that the other representatives of the B<sup>A</sup> family (P, Q, f, F) are, all of them, Renaissance copies, L would hardly be entitled to so much consideration. For it is nothing but an ordinary twelfth-century MS., neither better nor worse than the average codex of its time, by no means free from careless errors and written on a poor quality of vellum. The transcription has been divided in equal portions between three scribes:—

(1) foll. i–xix, containing Books I to V, xxxix. 7,

(2) foll. xx–xxxvii, containing V xxxix. 8–IX lxix title-heading,

(3) foll. xxxviii–end,<sup>1</sup> containing IX lxix. 1–end.

These three transcribers worked simul-

taneously, as we see from the awkward gaps (of a whole column and more) between the portions allotted to them; and, as is so often the case, the first of the three shews superiority both in penmanship and intelligence.

The contrast between his work and that of his immediate successor is very marked. The second transcriber produces a bad impression at the outset by the slovenly writing of his first page and the omission (until V liii) of the title-headings of the epigrams. He has an irritating habit of misreading the word he has to copy and transcribing it wrongly, only to correct it the next moment. For example, in V lv, at v. 2 *quare]* *plane corr.* *quare*; v. 4 *ore]* *ove corr.* *ore*; and when he leaves uncorrected absurd errors like *ad latere* for *ad latres* (V ix, 1), *ridere barba* for *redire Narbo*, we have no hesitation in writing him down with Dogberry. One of his deviations however is so curious as to make us wonder whether there was not a marginal variant in the original. At VI xlivi. 7 *sqq.*:

Quondam laudatas quocumque libebat ad undas

Currere nec longas pertinuisse vias,  
Nunc urbis vicina iuvant facilesque recessus,  
Et satis est, pigro si licet esse mihi,

our Dogberry has written in the third line *regressus* but has immediately substituted for it *recessus*, which is the reading not only of the B<sup>A</sup> family, but also of the inferior C<sup>A</sup> family and of the Anthology MSS. (the A<sup>A</sup> family). Less interesting is his *pectore*,

<sup>1</sup> The MS., as we have it, ends at XIV clvii. 1, the last leaf (fol. lvii) having been lost.

which he corrects to *nomine*, at VII xii. 7. We are reminded of the famous variant in Juvenal VIII 239 by his *gentes*,<sup>1</sup> corr. *montes*, at VIII xxxvi. 5. But as a rule his miswritings and rewritings are tedious and provoking to the last degree. It is a thousand pities that the first scribe did not undertake the transcription of the whole volume. For the first scribe's portion is a meritorious reproduction of an original which was itself, in this earlier portion at least, very correct. One might almost print word for word and letter for letter as the first transcriber has written and be no further from the 'ipsa verba' of Martial than any standard text, say Gilbert's (in the small Teubner edition) of to-day. Take the first fifteen epigrams as a sample. Here are the divergences of L from Gilbert's text :

Ad Catonem 2 vulgi] volgi ; iii. 11 lascive] lascivie ; iv. 8 vita proba] vita proba est ; v. 1 naumachiam] naumachias ; vi. 2 inlae-sum] illaesum ; viii. 1 Thraseae consumma-tique] Thraseae consummatique ; 2 salvus] salvos ante corr. ; 3 enses] ensis ante corr. ; ix. 1 Cotta] Cocta ; x. 3 nil nichil ; 4 in illa petitur] in illa appetitur ; xi. 1 quina] bina ; 3 portantes] portantis ; xii. 1 Her-culeas gelidi] Herculei gelidas ; 3 dilectaque] delectaque ; 5 umbras] auras ; 7 conlapsa] collapsa ; 9 querellas] quaerelas ; 10 par-tam magnae] parta magnae ; xiii. 3 feci] feē (i.e. fecit) ; 4 quod tu] tu quod.

It will be seen that about as many are improvements as deteriorations of Gilbert's text ; and the only reason why these good readings have not already been printed is the wholly inadequate knowledge of the Gennadian text that prevailed at the time of Gilbert's edition. Consider, for a moment, the last reading cited, *tu quod*. The line it comes from is the closing line of the epigram on Arria and Paetus (I xiii) :

Casta suo gladium cum traderet Arria  
Paeto,  
Quem de visceribus strinxerat ipsa suis,  
"Si qua fides, vulnus quod feci non dolet"  
inquit,  
"Sed quod tu facies, hoc mihi, Paete,  
dolet."

Surely the B<sup>A</sup> variant *tu quod* is an excellent one, but neither in Gilbert's nor in Friedlaender's edition is there any mention of it.

<sup>1</sup> The word *gentes* appears in contracted form here and at VIII xi. 3, *gns* (second transcriber) and XII vi. 5 *gts* (third), each with superscript stroke to indicate the contraction.

Our MS., as we shall see later, seems to have been copied from an original in Lombard script, the script prevalent in Italy from about the eighth century onwards (it persisted longer in the South than the North) ; and the monastery from whose library it passed some years ago (see 'Studi Italiani' VIII, 124) is the Monastery of S. Maria Curtis Orlandigorum at Lucca. It is in all probability the codex described in the 'Iter Italicum' of Zacharias (1762), vol. I, p. 26 as 'antiquissimus ac forte undevicimo saeculo conscriptus Martialis codex.'

It bears corrections from more than one hand. We can distinguish :

(1) corrections by the scribe himself at the moment of transcription (L<sup>1</sup>) ;

(2) corrections by a contemporary, presumably the 'corrector' (L<sup>2</sup>). They seem to be taken from the original from which our MS. was transcribed ;

(3) corrections by a later pre-Renaissance hand or hands (L<sup>3</sup>), taken from a text of the C<sup>A</sup> family ;

(4) still later corrections, partly mere conjectures, but mainly from the 'Itala' or Renaissance text. They are by more hands than one, but may conveniently be grouped under the common symbol L<sup>4</sup>. A specimen is II xliii. 1 Candide, *kouā φιλων*, haec sunt tua, Candide, *kouā*, the Renaissance re-casting of the line, which L<sup>1</sup> reproduced faithfully from its Gennadian original as :

*kouā φιλων* haec sunt tua, Candide,  
(-da MS.) *kouā*.

The Renaissance version is an Italian scholar's attempt to fill up the gap in the defective line offered by inferior MSS., viz., *kouā φιλων* haec sunt tua, Candide, *kouā* (with haplography of the repeated *haec sunt*).

Only L<sup>1</sup> and L<sup>2</sup> are of importance for the Gennadian text. L<sup>3</sup> has supplied omissions here and there, e.g. II xx. 2, (wanting in the B<sup>A</sup> archetype) IV lxix. 2 (separated by an accident in the B<sup>A</sup> archetype from IV lxix. 1), as well as some of the epigram-headings left out by the second transcriber, (e.g. V xliii.) ; but has drawn from some MS. of the inferior C<sup>A</sup> family. This L<sup>3</sup> gives IV lxix. 2 (on fol. 7v.) the C<sup>A</sup> reading *bona*, whereas the line, where it actually was transcribed from the original into our MS. (on fol. 16 v) shews the B<sup>A</sup> reading *bene*. The title-heading supplied by L<sup>3</sup> for V xliii. is the C<sup>A</sup> heading 'De Thaide et Leucania,' while the B<sup>A</sup> heading (found in PQ) is 'De Leucania sine dentibus.' It seems to be L<sup>3</sup> which has

(v)  
pr  
pr  
na

op  
th  
m  
of  
E  
R  
of  
wh  
tra  
ca  
wh  
I  
to  
tu  
Th  
L<sup>A</sup>  
tio  
MS  
the  
on  
tra  
pat  
nem  
each  
ind  
cial  
mon  
call

F  
and  
reg  
we  
rela  
the  
as  
com  
corr  
Pref  
but  
corr  
It c  
oth  
mor  
incl  
cess  
out b  
that  
from

<sup>1</sup> F  
scrib  
the  
se  
our  
sy  
for pr

added on fol. 1. r, epigrams i–ii. of Book I. (which begins on fol. 1 v.), so that the presence of these two epigrams in L is no proof of their having belonged to the Gennadian text.

L<sup>4</sup> gives a good deal of trouble in the opening pages; for this hand has re-traced the writing where it was faded and often makes it impossible to determine the reading of L<sup>1</sup>. The third word of the prefatory Epistle of Book I appears as *secuturam*, a Renaissance reading, but luckily the traces of *secutum* (suprascript, by L<sup>1</sup> or L<sup>2</sup>) are not wholly effaced. Erasure has obliterated all trace of the original reading (probably *causidici set causidicis et*) in XI. xxx. 1, where L<sup>4</sup> has (*causidici*)*s os*. It is in many, I might almost say, in most cases impossible to be sure whether the tail-stroke which turns *e* into *ae* does not come from L<sup>4</sup>. The Greek words in I xxvii. 7 are added by L<sup>4</sup>, the scribe having left a blank space.

The above may serve as a rough description of the characteristic features of our MS., which is written in two columns to the page, each column of 48, (47, 49) lines, on vellum that has (and had previous to the transcription) a good many holes and rough patches. The script is the ordinary continental minuscule, abounding in contractions, each of the three transcribers shewing independence in this respect,<sup>1</sup> and is, especially towards the close of the volume, rather more crowded than is consistent with calligraphy.

Before we proceed to examine whether and to what extent we can glean any hints regarding the nature of the B<sup>A</sup> archetype, we must first enquire into the precise relationship of L and the other members of the B<sup>A</sup> family. F, being a 'mixed' text, is as much a member of the C<sup>A</sup> family; it comes from an original which had a C<sup>A</sup> text corrected from a B<sup>A</sup> text (see Friedlaender's Preface, p. 96). Q is definitely a B<sup>A</sup> codex, but its original had numerous additions and corrections from some Renaissance source. It contains the Spectacula, for example, and other epigrams (e.g. the spurious 'Rure morans,' etc.) and lines which were not included in the B<sup>A</sup> archetype; and this process of contamination has been further carried out by the work of two correctors Q<sup>2</sup> and Q<sup>3</sup>, so that a MS. copied from Q would be as remote from the Gennadian recension as, let us say,

<sup>1</sup> For example, *et* is expressed by the first transcriber by a sign like our Arabic numeral 7; while the second uses that ligature that is still preserved in our symbol &c. The third transcriber writes *prære* for *praestare*.

that other British Museum codex (Harl. 12004), which contains the Gennadian 'subscription' here and there: *Ego Torquatus Gennadius emendavi*, but only a small proportion of the true Gennadian readings. At a still further remove than Q stands f, copied from a 'corrected' original. P is a far truer representative of the family, although Q may not by any means be despised. For example, the title headings and Gennadian 'subscriptions' in P, through the fault of the 'rubricator' either of P or of the original from which P was copied, cease with Book V.<sup>2</sup> Q continues them to the end of the volume and so has preserved the interesting entry at the beginning<sup>3</sup> of the Xenia (Book XIII iv.), which tells us that Gennadius published his edition in the consulship of Vincentius and Fravitta, 401 A.D., 'in foro divi Augusti.'<sup>4</sup> Q therefore is no copy of P. L, like Q, has these epigram-titles and 'subscriptions' (the latter, of course, only at the end and beginning of each book) throughout. The title-headings, with the exception of those in the Xenia and Apophoreta (Books XIII–XIV),<sup>5</sup> betray illiterate authorship by such freaks as DE SVPERBIA CHRESTESII (the heading of VII lv. which begins: Nulli munera, *Chreste, si remittis*), AD BISSENAM (IV lxxvi. Milia misisti mihi sex bis sena petenti. The C<sup>A</sup> family have the same title), but are not without interest to students of late Latin.<sup>6</sup> But Q is no copy of L, nor is P either; for L, especially in the second transcriber's portion, has many omissions and blunders from which P and Q are exempt. Thus L

<sup>2</sup> In f the 'subscriptions' cease with Book VII.

<sup>3</sup> XIII i–iii. were 'extra ordinem paginarum' (cf. IX. init.), so that the real beginning of Book XIII, the 'Xenia,' is at epigram iv.

<sup>4</sup> L has preserved for us the fuller form of this clause, viz. 'in forum (leg. foro) divi Augusti Martis.' The *forum Augusti* was styled the *forum Martis* from the fourth century, according to Jordan, 'Topography,' pp. 213, 472; and at the time of this publication the old and the new name were used in conjunction. In the prefatory Epistle of Book IX the opening was written as part of the 'subscription' and is wholly omitted by P, while Q has curtailed it. L has it in full: *Ave mi Torani, frater karissime.*

<sup>5</sup> I cannot understand why Friedlaender should discredit Q's title-headings in these two books. They are as Gennadian as the 'subscriptions.' Now that Prof. Maleyn in his recently published work on Martial (in Russian unfortunately) has shewn that all or most of the supposed discrepancies between P and Gruter's *Palatinus* are non-existent, the 'consensus' of P and Pal. goes for nothing.

<sup>6</sup> A late Latin use of *circa*, which has received some attention from scholars lately (see Archiv f. lat. Lexicographie, viii, 179; ix, 559) is found in the heading of VIII xi.: *De nimio amore Romae circa Caesarem.*

omits VII xcii. 5–8 (through homoeoteleuton), XII xiv. 6–8 (through homoeoarchon), XII lv. 11 and 13 and X xxxv. 11 (both through homoeoteleuton). Its omission of IX ci. 5 seems to have been due to the transcriber's difficulty in deciphering his original, for a blank space is left for the line.

All these lines are found in P and Q. So are single words omitted by L, such as *gaudet* IX xlvi. 12, *Brutus* XI v. 9. And mistakes like these of the second and third transcribers of L: *renomina* for *renovas qui nomina* VII xxxii. 1; *suit* for *furi* VI lxxxix. 2; *regnat* for *res negat* IX xxxvi. 8; *vegetabit* for *negabit* IX lvii. 12; *sineat* for *si videat* IX lxv. 14; *super (sr)* for *frater (fr)* XI x. 2 (cf. *califrate* for *Calistrate* IX xv. 5); *stant* (*stāt*) for *frater (frāt)* IX liv. 6, are not reproduced in P and Q. L therefore cannot be the archetype of these two MSS.

This is a fortunate circumstance; for the errors of an archetype are often irretrievable. The B<sup>A</sup> archetype omitted the penultimate word of XII xxix. 1, and since this epigram is not found in MSS. of the other two families, we have no means of discovering the missing word. Editors generally supply *Pontice* as a stop-gap:

Hermogenes tantus mapparum, *Pontice*, fuit est.

At X xlvi. 1 the B<sup>A</sup> archetype substituted *iucundiores* for *beatiorem*, through the inadvertence of some scribe who was thinking of the neighbouring word<sup>1</sup> *iucundissime*:

Vitam quae faciunt *iucundiores*,  
Iucundissime Martialis, haec sunt;

Here C<sup>A</sup> and A<sup>A</sup> come to the rescue with *beatiorem*; but so far as regards the B<sup>A</sup> text, we are left without a clue to the right word.

We may then regard P, Q, and L as independent witnesses to the text of their common B<sup>A</sup> archetype, although there is a strong probability that P and Q belong to one and the same branch of the family. To L, as the oldest of the three,<sup>2</sup> we must look

<sup>1</sup> This is a well-known error in MSS. and is usually, though not always, occasioned by the similarity of the two neighbouring words. An instance in L is *victorem* for *videtur* in VIII ii. 2: *Victorem modo cum videtur Histri.* Both P and Q have *videtur*.

<sup>2</sup> L has preserved IX x., an epigram omitted by PQ, also (like f) *malandit* for *male audit* in II lvi. 1, a strange form which PQ (very pardonably) omit. The C<sup>A</sup> archetype had the same form, which must not be too hastily discarded. It indicates that the two words had coalesced into a 'word group,' like *mal(e)factum*.

for suggestions regarding the archetype's nature and composition, but in all our inferences we must remember that we do not know by how many stages the three MSS. were removed from their common source.

L abounds in confusions of *a* and *oe*, e.g. II xl. 7 *locuari* for *lavari*; VIII xxxiii. 2 *ha* for *hoc*; IX xlvi. 4 *doctis* for *datis*; X lxviii. 12 *iocis* for *Lais*; and in still more of *t* and *a*, e.g. X lxviii. 4 *tricina* for *Arcina* (so XII xxxii. 10 *tricinum* for *Arcinum*); VIII xviii. 7 *utrio* for *Vario* (so VIII lix. 6 *varoque* for *utroque*); IX lii. 4 *naraque* for *utraque*; IX ii. 4 *auum* for *tuum* (so VIII lxxx. 1 *tuorum* for *avorum*); X xiii. 10 *cotaa* for *Cotta* (in X xlxi. 4 and lxiv. 6 *Cotta* has become *coacta*). The *\*Apes* *\*Apes* of IX xi. 15, written in Roman character, has become *tres ares*; in XII xxxii. 17 *aura* is disguised as *tura*; in IX ci. 17 *contudit* as *cum audit*; in X xxxv. 14 *autro* as *amaro*. Rarer is the confusion of *mi* and *tu*, e.g. XI lii. 5 *laomica* for *lactuca*; X xxx. 1 *fortue* for *Formiae*. In XIV c. 1 *Catulli* was at first written *Camilli*. These confusions, shared by all three scribes, point unmistakeably to a Lombard minuscule original. The frequent confusion of *i* and *l*,<sup>3</sup> e.g. *balas* for *Baia* throughout XI lxxx.; *vale* for *Baiae* VI xlhi. 7; *lu* for *in* XI xxi. 11, although not exclusively suggesting this origin is not inconsistent with it. And since the different transcribers shew different degrees of susceptibility to confuse these letters, we may conclude that it is the immediate original of L which was written in this script.

The same confusions are found in the other MSS. derived from the B<sup>A</sup> archetype. Thus in IV lxiii. 1:

Dum petit a Baulis mater Caerellia Baiae instead of *a* *Baulis* we find *ab oculis* in PFL (Q has *a baulis*). So III lviii. 35 f has *sassinoete* for *Sassinate*; V xxviii. 2 *ocule* for *Aule*. At I xcii 8 Q (like L<sup>1</sup>) has *noctes* for

<sup>3</sup> The minuscule form of *i* which is scarcely distinguishable from minuscule *l* is the 'long' or 'tall' form, used by careful scribes only (or mainly) in two circumstances, (1) for consonantal *i* (j), e.g. *aiō*, (2) for initial *i*, especially before *n*. From the first has come our letter *j*; from the second, if I am not mistaken, the early Irish expression of the preposition *in*, a preposition which happens to have the same form in Latin, Irish, English, German and other languages. For this preposition Irish scribes often write *hi*; and linguists have laboured at an explanation of the initial *h*. I believe the sign to be as conventional as our old-fashioned 'ye' for 'the.' This was never pronounced with *y*, but merely written with a sign that resembled the *y*-sign. No more was the Irish preposition ever pronounced with *h*.

the  
L  
ar  
th  
Ill  
of  
X  
typ  
ba  
Ge  
th  
me  
(q-  
tur  
for  
(bu  
ma  
of  
by  
for  
pen  
adm  
V  
arch  
the  
man  
of j  
furt  
retur  
Pol  
frien  
of t  
tissi  
1 T  
publ  
milit  
Latin  
sense  
provin  
of ex  
vari  
letter  
of LP  
the a  
epigr  
the C  
the v  
may h  
but fr  
2 In  
ad Ca  
xx.-xi  
1; I  
accou  
give or  
NO.

nates. In III lviii, 29, in the description of the townslaves at the country-house:

Exercet hilares facilis hortus urbanos,  
we find *hormis* for *hortus* in PQF, although L has *hortus*.<sup>1</sup> So IX xxxviii, 7 PQ have *armis* for *artus*. In I cii, 11:

In ius, o fallax atque infitior, eamus,  
the B<sup>A</sup> MSS. begin the line with *Induso* or *Illuso*. In XI xxi, 7 the first three letters of *pthisico* have in *f*, as in L, become *pah*; in XI lxi, 5 *f* has *mamila* for *manult*.

All this suggests that the common archetype of LPQF was a MS. written in Lombard minuscules, in other words that the Gennadian text has been transmitted to us through an Italian channel. The confusion of *ti* with *q* in L, e.g. *sequā eos* for *Setina meos* (-tīeos) IX xxii, 3; *piost* for *piosque* (*q.*) IX iii, 11, suggests the Lombard ligature of *ti*; and the substitution of *s* (i.e. *sibi*) for *sunt* IX xxiv, 3 suggests the Lombard (but not exclusively Lombard) practice of making the contraction sign vertical instead of horizontal. The confusion of *en* and *et* by the third transcriber (e.g. XI xxi, 4 *uenus* for *vetus*; 9 *ueneres* for *veteres*; XII iii, 7 *pene* for *pete*; XII viii, 9 *genae* for *Getae*) admits of more than one explanation.

Whether it was this Lombard minuscule archetype or some earlier archetype in which the transpositions that characterize the B<sup>A</sup> manuscripts first occurred, we have no means of judging.<sup>2</sup> Nor may we venture, without further evidence, to identify it with the *codex vetustissimus Langobardis litteris* of which Politian speaks. Politian in a letter to a friend on the subject of the proper spelling of the word *culcita* directs him to the 'vetustissima exemplaria' of Suetonius (in Tiberio)

<sup>1</sup> The mysterious item in the Geneva Papyrus published by M. Nicolle *ad hormos confidicudos*, a military task, suggested to me the possibility of a Latin loanword from the Greek, *hormus*, with the sense of 'trench, chain of trenches.' But now that L provides *hortus*, we are absolved from the necessity of explaining 'obscurum per obscurum.' A slight variation in the form of early minuscules makes the letter look like *co*. In X xii, 9 is the *cognoscendus* of LPQF a mere scribe's error for *agnoscendus*, or is it the actual reading preferred by Gennadius? This epigram is not included in the A<sup>A</sup> Anthology, but the C<sup>A</sup> archetype had *adnoscendus*. In XIII lxv, 2 the variants *lautorum condere* and *lautorum mandere* may have come not from divergent ancient recensions but from the mere blunder of a mediaeval scribe.

<sup>2</sup> In the B<sup>A</sup> family we find this order: I. Epist., ad Cat., (om. i.-ii.), iii.-xiv.; xlvi. 2-cii. 2; xv.-xli. 3 (om. xli. 4-xlviii. 1); IV xxiv. 2-lxix. 1; I ciii. 3-IV xxiv. 1; IV lxix. 2, etc. An account of the causes of this arrangement I hope to give on another occasion.

and Martial (in Apophoretis), telling him that the spelling which they attest is *culcita*. The 'codex optimus' of Suetonius, he says, is to be found in the Vatican (it is now lost), that of Martial in the Medicean Library. The latter MS. (described<sup>3</sup> as above) he appeals to on another occasion (Miscellan. XXIII) for the reading *mulo* (the B<sup>A</sup> reading) in VI lxxvii, 7.

That the title-headings of the epigrams in the original of L were at least occasionally in minuscules and not in capitals, we may infer partly from the occasional use of minuscules in L, when the transcriber failed to notice that it was a title-heading and not a line of Martial that he was copying,<sup>4</sup> partly from confusions like the third transcriber's *locvs* for *laus* in the headings of IX lxxxiii, X xxviii, xxx, or *abigia* for *abit* in the heading of XI xvi. The numerous marginal directions to the 'rubricator' in L (by the first transcriber) have, no doubt, helped to keep the division and arrangement of the epigrams more correct than it is in other MSS. of this family. And the useful habit of indicating by 'catch-words' the proper sequence of the quaternions, e.g. *Necaret* (*sic*) *officio* (IV lxxviii. 6), at the bottom of fol. 16 v., prevents any wrong

<sup>3</sup> Neither of the two MSS. of the B<sup>A</sup> family now in the Medicean Library, F and f, suit the description. In a copy of the Paris quarto edition of 1680, at present in the Leyden Library (760 D 5), but formerly in the possession of P. Burmann, there are marginal collations, copied by Burmann 'ex J. Goyses codice (i.e. printed edition with written marginalia) qui eum a Beverlandio accepit.' The manuscript, known as f, a paper codex of the fifteenth century, is the 'Florentinus,' whose readings are recorded by Burmann (e.g. I iii. 1 'latebras, sed in marg. al. tabernas'). Like F it has *culcitra* in both passages of the Apophoreta (viz. XIV exix, 2 and clxii, 1). On the fly-leaf of Burmann's volume there is an entry regarding the Florence MS. twice mentioned by Politian: 'Codex Florentinus. Politian. VII Epist. ult. De hoc et alii vid. Miscell. cap. 29'; but this entry does not give the shadow of a proof that Beverland identified Politian's MS. with f. In the margin at I xix. 2 he characterizes the latter as 'vet. cod. chartaceus Biblioth. Mediceae,' a description which exactly suits f.

<sup>4</sup> The third transcriber is especially prone to this error. The title-heading of XI xlvi. 'Ad medium qui non,' etc., he has so copied as to make the heading look exactly like a line of poetry and to give the two epigrams xlvi. and xlvi. the appearance of one long epigram. One can see the reason of the numerous cases of 'conflation' of neighbouring epigrams in our MSS. of Martial. The first scribe has written the first half of the long heading of V xxxix. in minuscules. But in this he was faithfully copying the archetype, for PQf have precisely the same. If we compare such mistakes with the mistake (mentioned below) made by L in IV xlvi. 11, the inference is natural, that the title-headings in the archetype were regularly in minuscules, distinguished from the text by colouring.

arrangement of a loose quaternion, such as that which has produced in the B<sup>A</sup> archetype the transposition of IV xxiv, 2-lxix, 1 (see above).

Most mediaeval MSS. have their margins dotted with symbols like *chr(esimon)*, *nota*, *d(octe)*, etc., and it is possible that the excerpts in Anthologies (e.g. the A<sup>A</sup> family of MSS. of Martial) have been determined by these marginal signs in an archetype. Symbols like these are frequent in L, but there are others, which may possibly be of more importance. Thus at II xlvi. the word *hic* is found in the margin and, some lines below, at xlvi. 3 the letter *d*. Now in cases of omission, the 'corrector' of a mediaeval MS. would usually enter the omitted passage in the top or bottom margin, with the signs *h* or *hic* (*hoc*) and *d* or *deest*, the one sign being set at the gap in the text, the other at the beginning of the marginal entry. In Q there is a displacement here, for epigram xlvi. comes between xlvi. and xlvi. ; and it is conceivable that the scribe of L (it is the careful 'first transcriber' who is on duty) has copied these marginal signs from his original. The *hic* at the top of fol. 17 r., close to the end of the passage of Book IV that has been transposed in B<sup>A</sup> may also be significant.

A surer clue to a feature of the original is the following. Space was often saved in MSS. by writing the 'overflow' words or syllables of a line in the blank space at the end of a short neighbouring line. In early MSS. the addition is separated from the alien words beside it by means of an S-shaped bracket. The last word of IV xlvi. ended in the B<sup>A</sup> archetype with the syllables *-gium* (so Q), for which we find in P *-gisum*. A glance at L seems to give us the explanation. The scribe of L writes after *gi* the three letters *svm*, in rubricated capitals exactly like the title-leading (of epigram xlvi.) that occupies the next line. The inference is obvious, that in the archetype the 'overflow' syllable *-um* had found a place at the end of the title on the next line and was separated from the title by this S-shaped bracket; so that the impossible spelling *-gisum* was not the actual spelling of the B<sup>A</sup> archetype. Similarly our MS. explains the curious title *SERTVS*, instead of *tvs*, at XIII iv., the first of the Xenia (see above). For in L the Gennadian 'subscription' already mentioned and this title are not put in separate lines. The title and the 'subscription,' both in rubricated capitals, look like one and the same entry. Instead of the syllable *SER* we find

an oblique S with a cross-bar, which was really, I take it, the S-shaped bracket separating the title *tus* from the 'subscription,' but which was interpreted by scribes as the contraction for *ser*. They would adopt this interpretation the more readily, since the first word of the epigram is *serus*.

In IX lxviii. 10 PQ offer *grave* instead of *grave est*. We do not require the help of any other MS. to explain to us what has happened here. Clearly the archetype had the ordinary contraction for *est*, viz. *e*, but the scribe had omitted or written with a dry pen, the contraction stroke above. This *grave e* would naturally be copied as *grave*. The scribe of L (the third transcriber) has copied this *grave e* exactly as he found it.<sup>1</sup> Since unusual forms of contractions, that most fruitful source of error in MSS., are often copied without alteration from the original,<sup>2</sup> it will be well to turn our attention to the contractions found in L.

One interesting form is *quire* (with the contraction stroke omitted) for *Quirine* in X Iviii. 10; for it throws light on the Gennadian 'subscription' at the beginning of Book II: *Ego Torquatus Gennadius emendavi feliciter Quirine floreas*. The last two words (omitted in f) are in P *qui floreas* and in Q *qui reflorui*, but L has *quire floreas*, with contraction stroke above *quire*. Gennadius dedicated Book II of his edition to Quirinus, as he dedicated Book IV to Constantinus. At the beginning of Book IV the 'subscription' is: *Emendavi ego Torquatus Gennadius Constantine feliciter floreas* (so L and Harl. 12004; flores P, florens Q; ego T. G. em. feliciter constantine feliciter floreas f').

The mistakes in B<sup>A</sup> manuscripts at I xvi. 1 *quod* for *que*; XII lxxii. 4 *sunt* for *sed*; XIV iii. 2 *nominis* for *nobile*, are all easily explained by unusual contractions in the archetype, and in each case we find a contraction in L. That may, however, be a mere coincidence. So in IV xxxviii. 1 where *nisi* has become *ubi* in Q/F we find in L what must have stood in the archetype, the contracted form of *nisi*, viz. *u* (which some scribe mistook for *u*) with superscript *i*. But at IV liv. 2 where *prima* has become

<sup>1</sup> Another case where L gives us the exact reproduction of what was in the archetype is, I think, VI iii. 6 where *nobilis* is the true reading. P has *nobilis*, Q has *nbit*, f has *nubilis*. In L we find *nubit* with the second limb of *u* cancelled by a dot above and below. I fancy the archetype had *nubilis* with an obscure correction of the word to *nobilis*.

<sup>2</sup> Beside the usual contraction of *omnes*, viz. *oēs*, we find occasionally in L *ōs*. Does this come from the original of L?

*patria* in PQ, the word in L has the contracted form *p'ma*, while in the archetype (or original of PQ) it must have had the form *pria*. Contractions by 'suspension,' where a contraction stroke replaces the last syllable or syllables of a word, are common in early minuscule MSS., and have played havoc with terminations of verbs and the like. They are frequent in L but seem always to have definite functions. Thus *praestab* with contraction cross-stroke through *b* definitely means *praestabis* in L and not (as it might in an early minuscule MS.) also *praestabit*; *fec* with stroke above *c* in L means *fecit* only, not also *feei*, although *anau* means *anavi*. It may be a mere coincidence that L has this contraction of *praestabis* in III xlvi. 11, where Q has *praestab*, and this contraction of *fecit* in I xiii. 3, where the A<sup>A</sup> and C<sup>A</sup> manuscripts shew *feci* and the B<sup>A</sup> manuscripts *fecit*. A contraction by 'suspension' that is quite of the old type and has doubtless been copied from the original (and possibly by the scribe of that original from a still earlier one) is *stom* (with stroke above *m*) in XII Epist. 18 for *stomachum*.

The ligature *ec*, which from its liability to confusion with the *et-* and *ex-* ligatures was discarded at an early period from minuscule script, has left clear traces of itself at IX xxvii. 9 where L has *sexulo* for *seculo*, and at V xxiv. 1 *sexu* for *seculi* (written, I fancy, *seceli* with 'barred' *I*).

Turning from this somewhat disappointing part of the field, let us see what can be gleaned in the matter of the spelling of the Archetype. From a mere average twelfth-century MS. like L we must not expect anything like a faithful reproduction of the Archetype's, still less of Gennadius' orthography, but since the other Gennadian MSS. are Renaissance copies, the value of L is great by comparison. For it is Renaissance MSS. that have a bad reputation for foisting antique spellings, like *quom*, *volt*, *voltus*, *salvos* (Nom.), on their transcriptions. Twelfth-century MSS. are exempt from this fault but not wholly from a worse fault of Renaissance scribes, the 'doctoring' of lines to suit metrical or grammatical requirements.<sup>1</sup> The first transcriber, though he has many late spellings like *nichil*, and does not persist in the reproduction of *-vos*, *-vom* (e.g. I viii. 2 *salvos*, corr. *salvus*), gives

us great assistance in restoring the older spelling and shews that Gilbert is wrong in ruling out forms like *volt*, *voltus*. The second transcriber effaces these *vo*-forms as much as possible. After his appearance on the scene we are treated for a time to *ei* for *ti*, *Marcius*, *Marcialis*, *tociens*, *cenciens*, and so on; and *oe* is ruthlessly written *e*. We see the danger of pinning our faith to the spelling of a single MS., or even an archetype, when the character of the spelling within the MS. itself is changed with the advent of a new scribe. The line (V xxxix. 8) with which the second transcriber opens his task on fol. 20 r. i., begins with the word *Croeso*. He writes *Creso*. But it so happens that the first transcriber had begun this line before laying down his pen, so that on fol. 19 v. we find the same word, copied from the same archetype, but spelt differently, *Croesso*. The third transcriber, who found more difficulty than the others with Lombard *t*, has on more than one occasion written *volat* for *volt*. No clearer proof is required that *volt* and not *vult* was the spelling (I do not say the invariable spelling) in his original. The Acc. Pl. *-is* is often preserved in L, where other MSS. shew *-es*.

But the chief value of L lies in its contributions to the text. It supersedes Q in supplying a check upon P. As an example we may take Martial's account of the medical specialists of the day (X lvi. 3 *sqq.*):

Eximit aut reficit dentem Cascellius aegrum,  
Infestos oculus uris, Hygine, pilos;  
Non secat et tollit stillantem Fannius uvam,  
Tristia saxorum stigmata delet Eros;  
Enterocelarum fertur Podalirius Hermes:  
Qui sanet ruptos die mihi, Galle, quis est?

The fourth line of this quotation has for its second word *Saxōnum* in the C<sup>A</sup> family, but in P *servorum*; and this reading of P has been adopted by editors in the belief that it was the actual reading of the Gennadian recension. Q has *saxorum*, but Q is a weaker authority than P. Now however that L confirms Q, the reading of P must be discarded as a mere scribe's aberration, as valueless as its *petis* at X lxxxvii. 20, where LQ (with the A<sup>A</sup> text) read *credis*.

And it vindicates again and again the Gennadian text from errors which the 'consensus' of P and Q attributed to it: e.g. XI c. 3 *radat* L: *rodat* PQF; X v. 3 *erret* L: *esset* PQ; X v. 4 *raucos* L: *ramos* PQ; X v. 15 *inquieti* L: *in equiti* PQ; VII xvii. 5 *nido licet inseras* L: *modo licet*

<sup>1</sup> For instances, see Marx, *ad Herenni*, prolegg. p. 37. An example in L is II lxvi. 6, where the archetype had *Tangat et sanum* (for *sanum* probably). L reads *Et sanum tangat*, Q *Tangat et insanum*. P does not alter.

*PQ*; X xvi. 1 Gai *L*: Galle *PQ*. We have now a fairly certain text of the Gennadian recension.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The discovery of L and Prof. Maleyn's recently published account of the readings of P make a continuation of my articles on 'A Supplement to the App. Crit. of Martial' unnecessary. I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to Prof. Fried-

If some good fortune would bring to light a new codex of the A<sup>A</sup> family, our manuscript evidence for Martial would be satisfactorily complete.

W. M. LINDSAY.

Iaender, Father Ehrle, and Prof. Alfred Monaci for their kind assistance in the compilation of this Supplement.

#### METHOD IN STUDY OF THE MODES.

THE early study of modal usage was sadly hampered by preconceived ideas. It was taken for granted that each set of mode forms had a separate distinct province, and the aim of the investigator was to discover some 'fundamental meaning' for each mode that would explain every concrete case of that mode. Even to-day there appear, here and there, traces of the old logical theories that the subjunctive is the mode of possibility, the indicative of reality, etc. That such distinctions will not hold is perhaps nowhere more clearly evident than in the conditional sentence; the very fact that an indicative stands in a *si*-clause precludes its affirming anything with certainty about reality, excepting, of course, in those cases where *si* is used as the synonym of *ubi* or the like in general conditions.

In giving up the idea of finding some such fundamental meaning shining through each case of a given mode, Delbrück<sup>1</sup> took a step in the right direction. He hoped, by a study of the mode-suffixes and the earliest meanings found attached to these, to find out what was the *earliest* meaning conveyed by each mode, and to *derive* from these earliest meanings such uses as are found in literature. If there were material at hand to make the study of the mode-suffixes and their original meanings more than mere guess-work, this method might yield trustworthy results.<sup>2</sup> Later thought has tended to be conservative. Starting with the known modal usages it has tried to reach back a step, by inference, into preliterary darkness. The theory that seems to best explain the known facts is that, in the period before literature began, mode (and

tense) forms were used rather indiscriminately—that they were of shifting application, rather than of fixed and determined value according to the old theories. This view is supported by two lines of argument; first, the development from vague to definite in the use of mode forms within the literary period: (*e.g.*, the use of subjunctive forms by Homer and Plautus as contrasted with later usage); second, the different way in which the I.E. languages have applied the same or cognate forms to the expression of modal thought: *e.g.*, *ero* and *sim* are subjunctive and optative respectively, if judged by the standard of cognate languages. Further, *e*-forms of the future indicative in Latin (as *reges*, *reget*) are thought to be of the same formation as subjunctives such as *ames*, *amet*. These facts are very hard to explain if it be assumed that the early use of mode and tense forms was clear-cut, but very easy if it be assumed that such usage was indiscriminate and shifting.<sup>3</sup>

The acceptance of this latter view brings with it a certain emancipation of thought. The idea of a fundamental meaning for each mode is given up, and, in its place, we assume that the meanings actually found in literature have become attached to the mode forms by a process of gradual differentiation or specialization. The old theories, however, still live on, to a certain extent, in the persistent feeling that difference of mode is the sign of difference of meaning, *i.e.* that each mode has a province of its own not to be encroached on by any other. This feeling is doubtless fostered by a wholly natural liking for clear-cut distinctions, and also by the recognition of the great value of a formal classification as the point of departure for a syntactical investigation. A division according to mode and tense, and even person

<sup>1</sup> *Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Bergaigne, *De conjunctivi et optativi in Indo-europeis linguis conformatio et vi antiquissima*. Paris. 1877.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Paul, *Principien*, §§ 410 and 433. Brugmann, *Comparative Grammar*, Vol. iv. p. 459.

and number,<sup>1</sup> is very helpful, but it does not tell the whole story. For there are certain other elements of the speech-form, which, though often given scant attention, are so important that they sometimes make the choice of mode a secondary matter—the speaker's thought is readily conveyed whether one mode or another is used. Hence it is necessary to clear thinking that we give up any feeling that a division according to mode, tense, etc., is the key to every situation, and that functional differences *must* underlie every such variation of form. If this be not done, there is constant danger of trying to force distinctions where there are none.

A practical beginning looking toward a recognition of these added formal elements has been made in the observation that certain verbs,<sup>2</sup> by virtue of their root meaning, stand in the indicative in situations that call for the subjunctive of other verbs. *Verb-meaning* then is one of the factors that renders a division according to mode an inadequate index of function. Other factors, recognised generally as abstractions merely, may be reduced to concrete form by an examination of such a phrase as *quid ago?*

Ter. Phor. 447 : *Quid ago?* die, Hegio.

Ter. Hec. 715 : *Quid ergo agam*, Phidippe? *quid das consili?*

In the second case here cited both *agam* and a defining clause (*quid das consili?*) instruct the hearer that he is being appealed to for advice, but the context shows that *quid ago?* without the defining clause is just as readily understood. How does the hearer know that the literal meaning 'What am I doing?' is not intended? That this sense is not an impossible one is shown by the frigid joke in Plaut. Most. 368 : cf. Ter. Heaut. 343 : CLIT. *Quid ago nunc?* CLIX. *Tune?* *quod boni.* At the same time, the very fact that taking *quid ago?* in these passages in its literal sense makes a pun, is conclusive proof that the speaker intended, and the hearer understood it, in the deliberative sense.

Most important for the definition of the meaning was, doubtless, the *tone* and *manner* of the speaker: these elements made clear to the hearer that the words were an appeal for advice. Second may be mentioned the *general situation* — the speaker's obvious difficulty and need of advice. Third, specialization of phrases to certain uses; *quid ago?* was probably little used in other than

a deliberative sense.<sup>3</sup> Ter. Phor. 736-7 : *Quid ago?* . . . *Adeo, maneo, dum haec quae loquitur magis cognosco?* Ter. And. 639 : *Sed quid agam?* *adeamne ad eum et cum eo iniuriam hanc expostulem?*

The first pair of sentences treated were taken from dialogue, and illustrate one phase of the deliberative question — the asking of advice. This pair are spoken in soliloquy, and illustrate the other phase of such questions — the expression of the speaker's perplexity. It must be quite obvious that the mode of the verb in neither pair is the prime element in making the speaker's thought clear — the indicative is quite as 'deliberative' as the subjunctive when spoken in a certain tone and manner. Formal elements such as these must then be added to verb-meaning as factors which tend to make a division based strictly on mode an inadequate index of function.

These considerations may be expressed thus in a general principle: *other aspects of the speech-form than the mode of the verb may be the essential features that convey to the hearer those ideas which it is generally felt to be the province of mode to express, e.g., deliberation.* Two corollaries depend upon this principle. (1) It is not always possible to find a functional difference to correspond to a division according to mode. (2) It does not necessarily mean that a rule is a poor one if it be not clear-cut. In certain cases the facts may not warrant a statement stronger than that one mode is used *largely* or *prevailing*ly in the expression of a certain class of ideas.

The conditional sentence is another field in which the elements of tone and manner play a larger part than seems generally supposed. If the two future conditions 'If I go' and 'If I should go' be compared in the abstract, one would naturally say that the latter is the form of less probability. But, as a matter of fact, 'If I go' can be rendered in such a fashion as to inspire ten times the doubt about fulfilment that a mere formal 'If I should go' would do. The provinces of these two forms overlap, and we are justified in saying no more than that the form 'If I go' tends to be used in cases of greater probability of fulfilment. If this be true of English, why try to force

<sup>1</sup> E. P. Morris, 'Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus,' *A.J.P.* Vol. xviii. *E.g., posse, licet.*

<sup>2</sup> The question *quid agis?* is another that illustrates the working of these same elements. No one mistakes the literal *quid agis?* (as seen in Cic. in Cat. I. 11. 27) for the *quid agis?* of greeting, though Plautus continually puns on the double meaning. It is interesting to note further, that in Cicero's Orations *quid ago?* is allowed once (p. Quint. 16. 53); *quid agam?* occurs three or four times.

unyielding distinctions on Greek and Latin, insisting that each concrete case of the use of a mode exemplify the rule laid down? Such a procedure seems quite misleading when applied to the use of the indicative, subjunctive and optative in future conditions. Again, on this same principle, if-clauses and *si*-clauses encroach upon the province of the concessive clause; the concessive tone in which the words are spoken may render unnecessary the more explicit 'even if' or '*etsi*'. Pronouncing the following sentences will make clear the difference in tone that exists between the pure and the concessive if-clauses. 'If I had ten thousand books, I would give some away'; 'If I had ten thousand books, I would not give one away.' On the written page we may have to wait until the apodosis is reached before we can interpret the if-clause with certainty, but in the spoken language the tone of the speaker settles the question at once, and also prepares the hearer for the kind of apodosis that is to follow.

A still further instance of tone and manner as defining elements is furnished by the language of Plautus. He is still using the present subjunctive largely for the present unreal conditional sentence, thus making this mode and tense a common speech-form for it and the ideal. Despite the ambiguity of the verbal form used, one person has no difficulty in making his thoughts clear to another.<sup>1</sup> Just as in English the tone of apology of 'If I had any, I would gladly give it' would clearly distinguish it from 'If I should get any, I should be glad to give it,' even though we expressed the two by the use of the same

speech-form, as Plautus did for the most part.<sup>2</sup>

The factors of tone and manner are largely lost on the written page. Sometimes a hint is given by the order of words, and, again, the reply of a hearer may make clear just the cast of thought conveyed to him. In a careful literary style influenced by the need of communicating in writing, naturally those elements<sup>3</sup> which may appear on the written page are utilized to a greater degree than is necessary in the spoken language of every-day life; in this latter style the 'irregularities' are doubtless to be explained largely by the presence of the (to us) more intangible, but not less real elements of the speech-form. However, I believe that these elements affect profoundly even the most careful written style; for we write largely as we *think* and *speak*. Cicero's orations seem to afford a striking illustration of this. It will be found that about one-seventh of the *si*-clauses there found in unreal conditional sentences are concessive.<sup>4</sup> It is possible that this large proportion is due to the fact that, in the preparation of his speeches, Cicero wrote unconsciously in the style he would use in speaking. In the delivery, as shown above, the tone used in speaking, rendered a specific introductory particle unnecessary.

H. C. NUTTING.

*University of California.*

<sup>2</sup> Greenough makes still another application of this principle in an article on 'The Contrary to Fact Construction,' *Harv. Studies*, Vol. vii.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., careful discrimination in the use of the modes.

<sup>4</sup> *A.J.P.* xxi., p. 270.

<sup>1</sup> See *Class. Rev.* xv. p. 52.

## REVIEWS.

### DIELS'S HERAKLEITOS.

*Herakleitos von Ephesos, griechisch und deutsch.* Von HERMANN DIELS. Pp. xii, 56. Berlin, 1901. 2 M. 40.

ALL students of Greek philosophy will welcome an edition of Herakleitos from the hands of Professor Diels, even though they are warned that it is not in any way meant to supersede Professor Bywater's exemplary

edition (Einl. p. x.). It is certainly true that the few additions that have been made to the fragments are of no great intrinsic value, nor has much been done since Bywater for the settlement of the text. A master like Diels can hardly, however, handle any document without clearing up some of its difficulties, and there are many brilliant things hidden away in the modest

footnotes. Noteworthy is the reading of fr. 10 (=59 Bywater) Συνάψιες ὅλα καὶ οὐχ ὅλα κ.τ.λ. ‘Couplets are: whole and not whole etc.’ This is based on a recension of the manuscript testimony (see Berl. Sitz. 1901, 188), and will very likely be adopted; but one misses the Homeric optative *οὐνάψεας*. Diels gives up the attempt to arrange the fragments, and places them in the alphabetical order of the authors who quote them. This plan has some advantages from the critical point of view; but it hardly does justice to the statement quoted by Diogenes Laertius (ix. 5) that there were three λόγοι, one *περὶ τὸν πατρόν*, one political and one theological. This is Stoic formalism, of course, but there must have been something in the book to justify it. Further, it seems to have been quite the regular thing to start with cosmology, to go on to man, and to end up with man’s relation to God or the world. Empedokles certainly did so.

The most valuable parts of Diels’s work are, beyond question, the introduction and the translation. He rightly refuses to believe that the system of Herakleitos was obscure. On the contrary, Herakleitos is ‘dark’ only in form, while Parmenides never made his system thoroughly clear even to himself. For that very reason Herakleitos had no successors, but only imitators, while the philosophy of Elea developed in every direction. As to the form of Herakleitos, his hierophantic tone is common to him with all the great men that grew up during that period of storm and stress, a period which can be compared only to the Reformation and the French Revolution. With all their differences of origin and temper of mind, Pindar, Aeschylus, and Herakleitos are attuned to the same hieratic note. On the other hand, the subjectivity of Herakleitos enlivens this hieratic stiffness. ‘Never did prophet swing the lash in so refreshingly individual a manner as the black-galled Basileus of Ephesos.’ ‘He opens the series of lonely men that have set down their proud thoughts of contempt for the world in the only suitable form, the Aphorism.’ ‘Thus spake Herakleitos’ was probably the beginning of his work, and ‘also sprach Zarathustra’ is the latest shoot put forth by the *genre*. So Diels has translated the Ephesian into the style of Nietzsche, and that with great skill. Take, for instance, the following:—

‘Denn alles, was da kreucht, wird mit Gottes Geisel zur Weide getrieben.’ (fr. 11=55 Byw.).

‘Die Zeit ist ein Knabe, der spielt, hin und her die Bretsteine setzt: Knaben-regiment!’ (fr. 52=79 Byw.).

‘Die Sibylle, die mit rasendem Munde Ungelachtes und Ungeschminktes und Ungesalbtes redet, reicht mit ihrer Stimme durch tausend Jahre. Denn der Gott treibt sie.’ (fr. 92=12 Byw.).

Diels says ‘Uebersetzen ist Spiel oder, wenn man will, Spielelei.’ This is true, no doubt, but such translation as he gives us is the highest kind of interpretation. There are, however, two points of interpretation on which I feel bound to maintain my own view until the arguments put forward in my *Early Greek Philosophy* have been shown to be inconclusive. I do not say that I am right, and that Zeller, Diels and Gomperz are wrong; but I cannot see my way to give in at present. Hitherto the reasons I adduced have been ignored; they have not been met.

The first point is the interpretation of the word λόγος. In 1892 I ventured to say that λόγος never meant ‘Reason’ (*Vernunft*) in Greek philosophy strictly so-called, and I am still waiting for an unambiguous example of such a use. Diels certainly does not translate the Herakleitean λόγος by *Vernunft*, but he says things which imply the common interpretation. He speaks, for instance, of ‘the omnipresence of the guiding “Word” (*Logos*),’ which is ‘at once the law of Nature and of Man’ (p. vi.). This can only be justified from fr. 92, 93 Byw. With regard to fr. 92, it is clear that, even if Herakleitos did say *τὸν λόγον δὲ ἔοντος ξυνοῦ*, he must, on Diels’s own showing, have meant exactly the same by λόγος as he did in fr. 2 *τὸν λόγον τοῦδε ἔοντος ἀεί*, for Sextus quotes fr. 92 after fr. 2 with the words ὁλίγα προσδιελθὼν ἐπιφέρει, and for that reason Diels makes these two fragments his first and second. But I suppose that no one now doubts Zeller’s interpretation of λόγος in fr. 2 (cf. E.G. Ph. § 52, n. 13). Fr. 93, on which Diels’s statement seems to be more expressly based, comes from Marcus Aurelius iv. 46 μεμνήσθαι δὲ... ὅτι φύ μάλιστα δηρεκώς ὄμλοισι λόγῳ τῷ τὰ ὅλα διοκοῦντι τούτῳ διαφέρονται. But, when we turn to his text, we find that Diels himself does not ascribe τῷ τὰ ὅλα διοκοῦντι to Herakleitos, and surely Bywater is right in giving λόγῳ to Marcus as well. In any case, there is not a scrap of evidence to justify us in ascribing to the Ephesian any ‘Logos-doctrine,’ in the Jewish or Christian sense, or even anything that can be historically connected with it. Diels says (p. x.) ‘Den Proteus λόγος in irgend einer andern Sprache zu fassen ist ja ganz vergebliches Mühen.’ This seems a little too strong. So far as I can see, Herakleitos uses the word λόγος in

two senses only, neither of which is at all remote from its meaning in everyday Greek. In the first place it is his own theory. It is not merely his 'discourse,' however, or 'what he has to say'; for 'everything comes to pass according to it' and it is 'common to all.' It is 'the word that came to Herakleitos of Ephesos,' and may fairly be written with a capital letter, 'the Word.' This is an idiom of the prophetic style, and Diels's translation 'das Wort' is quite adequate. On the other hand, I cannot accept his rendering of fr. 30 (= 23 Byw.) θάλασσα διαχέεται καὶ μετρέεται εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον, κ.τ.λ. 'Es zerfliesst das Meer und erhält sein Mass nach demselben Wort u.s.w.' Surely no Greek would understand *μετρεῖσθαι εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον* in any other than the quantitative sense, which I have tried to bring out in my translation 'is measured by the same tale' (E.G. Ph. p. 135). There are no other uses of *λόγος* in Herakleitos, and the English renderings 'Word' and 'tale' seem quite adequate to these.

The other point is the old question of the *ἐκπύρωσις*. On this Diels says: 'Die Weltverbrennung als Ende dieser Weltperiode, die ein grosses Weltjahr von 10,800 Jahren abschliesst, steht für H. jetzt fest.' This is said in a note on fr. 66 (26 Byw.), to which Gomperz also alludes as 'decisive' ('Greek Thinkers,' p. 536, Eng. trans.). The words (quoted by Hippolytos) are πάντα γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ἐπελθὼν κρινεῖ καὶ καταληψεῖται, and I admit that my scepticism as to the words *κρινεῖ καὶ* was unjustified. The aorist participle expresses time coincident with that of the leading futures; the *ἔφοδος* is the *κρίσις* and *καταληψίς*, and these in turn are judicial metaphors. The translation, then, should run: 'Fire coming on all things will judge and convict them.' But this no more proves a world-conflagration than 'All trespassers will be prosecuted' implies that trespassers will all be committed to prison on the same day. The best commentary is the solitary fragment of Anaximander (E. Gr. Ph. §§ 12, 13).

It cannot be said too often that there never was anything about an *ἐκπύρωσις* in the book of Herakleitos. I still hold that Plato, Soph. 242 d, 6 sqq. is quite inconsistent with any such idea, as even Zeller has to admit (cf. E. Gr. Ph. §§ 55, 62). Marcus Aurelius was a diligent student of Herakleitos, and his Stoic teachers would tell him that Herakleitos believed in the *ἐκπύρωσις*. But he did not find it there; for he says (x. 7) εἴτε κατὰ περίοδον ἐκπυρούμενον εἴτε ἀδίους ἀμοιβᾶς ἀνανεύμενον.

Kleombrotos in Plutarch (de def. or. 415 f.) says ὅρῳ τὴν Στοικήν ἐκπύρωσιν... τὰ Ἱπα-  
κλεῖτον... ἐπινεμούμενην (E. Gr. Ph. p. 166). These passages could not have been written if Herakleitos had ever definitely countenanced the theory of a periodical conflagration. Diels, like Zeller, admits that the doctrine in question is a 'scheinbare Inconsequenz,' and certainly the greatest thinkers have been inconsistent at times. But, before we charge one of them with an inconsistency, we ought to have proof that he actually maintained the view we allow to be inconsistent. The negative evidence of men who could not find the *ἐκπύρωσις* in Herakleitos far outweighs that of all the Stoic handbooks which ascribe it to him.

In my chapter on Herakleitos, I referred to certain fragments which seemed to me to contradict the conflagration theory. In fr. 20 (Bywater) the *κόσμος*, we are told, ἦν δεῖ καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ἔσται πῦρ δεῖσθαι, ἀπόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποβεννύμενον μέτρα. I do not quite understand Diels's translation of this, 'sein Erglimmen und sein Verlöschen sind ihre Masse.' He seems to take *μέτρα* as nominative, but I still think it is internal accusative, and that the translation should be 'with measures of it kindling and with measures of it going out,' and that the 'measures' are to be interpreted in the light of *μετρέεται εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον* (fr. 23). When one 'measure' of fire is kindled an equivalent 'measure' goes out. This is the *ἀνταριθμός* (fr. 22), the *διδοῖς ἀμοιβαῖς* that Marcus Aurelius found when he looked for the *ἐκπύρωσις* and could not discover it, and the *μέτρα* mean just what they meant to Diogenes of Apollonia (fr. 4. E. Gr. Ph. § 156). Nor will the equivalence of these *μέτρα* ever be violated; for ἡλιος οὐχ ἐπερβῆσται μέτρα εἰ δὲ μῆ, 'Ερυνές μν Δικης ἐπίκοντος ἐξενρήσονται (fr. 29). I can only read these words as a denial of the possibility of any *ἐκπύρωσις*, and this view is confirmed by the mention of *δίκη*. For, in early Greek philosophy, the meaning of *δίκη* is just the observance of an equal balance between different forms of being, 'opposites,' 'elements,' or whatever they are (cf. E. Gr. Ph. pp. 51, 73, 147).

I may, perhaps, have dwelt too much on these two points; but I think they are really important, and they have never been properly discussed. I cannot agree with Diels's views upon them; but I believe that the literary criticism of his Introduction will profoundly modify our whole attitude towards the fragments we still possess.

JOHN BURNET.

GRENFELL AND HUNT'S *AMHERST PAPYRI*, II.

*Amherst Papyri* (Greek). Part II. 1901.  
By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT.  
£2 10s. net.

THE second volume of this sumptuous publication contains several interesting classical fragments. I offer some suggestions on No. XIII. ‘fragment of a lost comedy, with marginal scholia.’ The editors are doubtless right on the strength of col. I. v. 2 ἔξ ὑπτίας in making Aristophanes the author (Pollux vii, 138 νῦν δ' ἔξ ὑπτίας μάθημα κολυμβητῶν Ἀριστοφάνης ἐπεὶ καὶ Πλάτων), and the probability is increased by the marginal note *eis Μάγυρα*. We all know Aristophanes’ fondness for repeating himself at short distance, and as there is nothing about Magnes in the *Acharnians*, *Clouds* or *Wasps*, the *Daitaleis* or *Babylonii* seem likely plays to have contained the allusion. Νῦν ἔξ ὑπτίας may be another of the tricks ascribed to Magnes (πάσας δ' ὑμῖν φωνὰς ιεῖς καὶ ψάλλων καὶ πτερυζίων καὶ λούδιων καὶ ψρίζον καὶ βαπτόμενος βατραχίους Knights 522, 3, epithets interpreted by the ancients of the titles of as many plays, and no less hazardously by the moderns of an early quasi-Aesopic *genre* of comedy) to hold his audience. The line before this is explained by the scholiast as a parody on a ‘vulgar expression’ ἐκπράσων ἡ μὴ μπράσοις, the meaning of which is not clear, seeing that ἐμπιπράσκειν rarely occurs. The text may presumably be restored ἐκβαλῶν σ' ἡ μὴ μβαλῶ, and if the reference to Magnes extend to this line we are reminded of ἐξεβλήθη πρεσβύτης ὁν Knights 425. In the scholion for τ<sup>τ</sup> read ο sc. ὅτι, and for αὐρό perhaps ἀπὸ καιροῦ.

The allusion to Magnes can hardly be carried farther than the second line, for the remainder appears to be a dialogue between two persons who are engaging in a suit or struggle: we have the forensic expressions ἐκκαλοῦντα σε 16, μάρτυρας 17, γραφὴν col. II. 1, ἐκκαλῶ 2. The Daitaleis contained one (or more) contests, and frag. 211 Kock τὸν Ἐρεχθία μοι καὶ τὸν Αἴγα κάλει is similarly worded. If the repartee of vv. 3-20 is between father and son, one may conjecture that Byzantium in 12 is used as in the *Wasps* 236 to denote the father's age, the τοσοῦτους χρόνους of 10 replied to in 11 χρόνος, 14 may be πρότερος ἥπερ ἔγω of the father: or if we take account of the scholion μαδᾶ (?) μαδᾶς, μαδῶν, cf. schol. *Plut.* 266) ὁ

φαλακ[ρὸς ἡρῷ] ἔγω. V. 15 the editors suggest εἴλλα[η]τον; with this the scholion πάισ (ἱ γει παρὰ may refer to the unknown source of the exclamation Ἑλλάνιε Ζεῦ Knights 1253. Col. II. if the practice of papyri is the same as that of later MSS., the editors are certainly right in saying that the line ἐπιστομεῖ τοο[ν] which is added on the upper margin and preceded by an antisigma, is intended to be read after v. 4. The sense also shows this: the father calls out his first witness, whom in view of frag. 211 one would wish to make a heroic personage, but γο[ν] does not seem to yield such a name. A few supplements may be conjectured: col. I. 1 ἑκβαλῶ γ σ', 2 νεῖν] ἔει, 6 εὐ οἰστ' ἥπτι, a 12 if the scholion τὸ τέλος τὴν δα[πάνη] is 12, τὸ τέλος must have stood in v. 12, 16 ἑκκαλ] οὗτα σε, 17 ἑκκαλεῖσθα] μάρτυρα, 18 ἀγω[νεῖ] 20 πε[πίσθαι], col. II. 3 μ[άλιστα τῶν ἐμῶν φίλων, 4 σε or σ' must be worked into this line, to be governed by ἐπιστομεῖ (for the word, cf. Knights 845).

No. XVI. contains different documents on its recto (s. II. A.D.) and verso (s. II. or III. A.D.). That on the verso turns out to be Apoll. Rhod. i. 775-795, and this author's documentary tradition is taken back nine centuries. There are a few variants, none of which have left traces elsewhere. I may mention two which are glossematic, 777 *αιθέρος* for *ἡέρος*, 786 *θυρᾶς* for *πύλας* (a common substitution in Homeric MSS.), and one of more importance, 791 *τρόπο] πολοιο* for *τρόπο] πύλης*.

The writing on the recto is plainly epic, and I venture to identify it with Antimachus. V. 18 *ἐπιστέψας* appears to correspond to fr. 21 (Kinkel) *πλήσεις ἀρ' ἐπιστράψας δέπαστρον*, where *ἐπιστράψας* was corrected into *ἐπιστέψας* by Biomfield. The active aorist of *ἐπιστέψειν* is not quoted from elsewhere by the Lexica. With this clue we easily connect v. 15 *οἰς τοκεέστοι τ[* with fr. 56 *πωρτύν ἀλόχουται καὶ οἰς τεκέέστοις θέντο;* *τοκεέστοι* in the papyrus must be *τεκέέστοι*, but on the other hand *θέντο* (or rather *θίθεντο*) is confirmed as against *ἔκαστοι*, of another quotation. Triptolemus in v. 19 suggests Demeter and therefore one may restore *ἔλευσται* v. 12, since Antimachus uses the epithet fr. 63 *Δημητρός τοι Ἐλευσίνις λερή οὐ.* Other possibilities are v. 19 *δέξε[αι]*, *Τριπτολεμό[ῳ]* cl. h. Dem. 474, v. 20 *ζωοῖς αὐε[γ]ροῖς*; in v. 3 *ἡλιον π[τ]* must be read so that a vowel follows *ἡλιον*.

The small fragment XI. is enigmatical,

but apparently poetical, although the verses as the editors say are divided between the lines. Some of the wording seems intelligible : v. 4 *sqq.* παρθενικαι κεφαλαιοιν νιδωρ καλπισιν εσβεσαν ακμην? v. 7 φιλινης θεραπαινης?

A characteristic of this volume is the

abundance of commentaries it contains: we are given Aristarchus' ἑπόμνημα on Herodotus I., and short scholia on the Iliad, the Odyssey and Callimachus. There are also pieces of orators and tragedians and a bilingual Babrius.

T. W. ALLEN.

#### HEMPHILL'S TRANSLATION OF PERSIUS.

*The Satires of Persius.* Translated with an Introduction and some Notes by the Rev. SAMUEL HEMPHILL, D.D., Litt.D., formerly Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin; Rector of Birr, and Canon of Killaloe. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, & Co., Ltd.; London: George Bell & Sons. 1901. Pp. xxiii, 47. 2s. 6d.

DR. HEMPHILL is a warm admirer of Persius, and his Introduction breathes a generous enthusiasm for an author whom he thinks less obscure than is generally supposed. He thinks he has been made doubly difficult by being published as an appendix to Juvenal. But the butterfly student whom he describes as having no time for Persius after he has worked at Juvenal would surely have given up Roman satire in despair, had he begun with the more difficult author. At all events this particular drawback to his study is not likely to exist in modern editions. I do not think we can say, with Casaubon (whose words Dr. Hemphill endorses), that Persius never forgets his theme, in the face of such passages as vi. 37-40 and v. 132 *sqq.* (where the theme is that the ease loving man is nevertheless a slave to Avarice, but at 137 P. flies off at a tangent, to shew the difficulty of being at once a business man and god-fearing).

The translation is smooth, and generally clear and accurate. The author is perhaps too sanguine as regards having printed Sat. I 'in a manner which ought to cause no difficulty': the paragraphing on p. 8 (i. 83-91) clearly implies dialogue, where (except perhaps

*bellum hoc* 87) all belongs to Persius. A list of departures from Buecheler's (1893) text is given (p. 43), but this is not complete, as at iii. 13 Dr. Hemphill translates *quod*, not *sed*, which that ed. has. A few passages in the translation might be slightly improved: thus in v. 15 *ore modico* corresponds to *stloppo*, &c., and 'chaste style' misses this. In vi. 51 *non adeo* cannot mean 'not so fast,'—even to those who imagine *adeo* an adverb here. At i. 5 *sqq.*, the old rendering is given, which makes P. first say 'you mustn't come forward and correct Rome's taste,' and immediately after do this very thing! The meaning is either, 'wouldn't you go up and correct her?' or 'you wouldn't join her, but would correct her.'<sup>1</sup>

The Notes shew that Dr. Hemphill has studied the recent literature on his author. I would refer particularly to i. 133, ii. 10, iv. 28, vi. 51 as examples. But surely Palmer's reading of i. 8 (*nam Romae—st!*)—*quis non*, &c.) does not deserve the approval here given it. The *est* of the MSS. is certainly explained by it, but who can suppose that P. made his interlocutor interrupt when as yet only the words 'for at Rome' had fallen from his lips—and this after quietly putting up with P.'s contemptuous allusion to the 'old women of Troy' and 'muddle-headed Rome.'

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

<sup>1</sup> I prefer the first rendering: Dr. Postgate some time since suggested the other, in which of course *que* has the force it so often has in Lucan.

## BLASS'S GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

*Evangelium secundum Matthaeum cum variae lectionis delectu edidit FRIDERICUS BLASS.*  
Teubner, 1901. 3 M. 50.

It is difficult to say what kind of welcome ought to be given to Dr. Blass's text of St. Matthew. That it should have appeared at all is evidence of the interest now taken in Germany in the textual study of the New Testament, an interest which has been largely stimulated by Dr. Blass's own writings. It would be moreover impossible for Dr. Blass to produce a book that was not full of interest and instruction for those who have themselves worked at the subject. But the text he has constructed seems to the present writer eminently wilful. It is quite exciting to read; one can never predict what readings will be put in the place of honour.

Dr. Blass brings forward no new theory of the history of the text. 'Maximum id est,' says he in his Preface (p. iv.), 'quod in singulis quaestionibus non tam testes quam res ipsae spectandae sunt. Incorruptum testem nullum habemus, et vehementer viceror ne citra auctoris *autógraphos* nullus inveniri possit, neque genere corruptelae inter se singuli testes differunt, sed numero tantum peccatorum.' This, if true, is a cry of despair. I remember once seeing a letter in which Dr. Hort wrote concerning one of Tischendorf's many editions *He still thinks he may read exactly as he pleases*, and this judgement fits only too well upon Dr. Blass's St. Matthew.

Of the authorities more particularly to be followed in editing the text Dr. Blass lays special stress on the Sinai Palimpsest and, curiously enough, on St. Chrysostom. He is not afraid to follow either of these singly against all other testimony. Thus for instance, to cite a reading which he himself brings forward in the very first page of his Preface, he reads in Matt. xix. 15 ἐπορεύηται with the Sinai Palimpsest against ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν of all other authorities. Dr. Blass thinks ἐκεῖθεν superfluous 'quasi possit aliquis aliunde profici sci quam illine ubi sit' (p. iv.). That is true, but may not the same consideration have appealed to the translator of the Old Syriac version? The use of a superfluous ἐκεῖθεν after verbs of 'going' is characteristic both of Matthew and Mark, and subsequent editors and translators may very well have felt inclined here and there

to leave it out; St. Luke in particular seems to have shared the views of Dr. Blass, as a reference to the Concordance will shew.

Even less defensible is Dr. Blass's emendation of ἀνάστασις in Matt. xxii. 23 ff. He observes very truly that the word ἀνάστασθαι and its kindred are generally avoided in Matthew, ἐγερθῆναι being used instead. When therefore Dr. Blass saw that the Sinai Palimpsest had **חַיָת מִתְא** in Matt. xxii. 23 ff.,<sup>1</sup> he concluded that this represented another Greek reading, and his text accordingly has λέγοντες μὴ είναι ζωὴν τῶν νεκρῶν, instead of λέγοντες μὴ είναι ἀνάστασιν. But **חַיָת מִתְא** does not mean ζωὴ νεκρῶν. It is one of the regular Syriac equivalents for ἀνάστασις [νεκρῶν], and is so used in the Peshitta text of 1 Cor. xv. 12 ff., to name one instance out of many. Ζωὴ νεκρῶν would be in Syriac **חַיָת מִתְרָא** (*hayyay mîthê*), not **חַרְתָ מִתְא** (*hayyaθ mîthê*), which always means 'the coming to life of the dead.'

But Dr. Blass is not always rash: indeed he often surprises one by his adherence to the ordinary Greek text in places where it might have been thought that he would be tempted to leave the beaten track. Thus he makes no change in Matt. i. 16, he keeps ὁ πρῶτος in Matt. xxi. 31, and he refuses to add καὶ τῆς νίμφης at the end of Matt. xxv. 1.<sup>2</sup> On other occasions he adopts good readings chiefly supported by 'Western' authorities, e.g. τοῦ δὲ χριστοῦ Matt. i. 18 (= lat.vt syr.vt); ὅτι ἡγγικεν instead of μετανοεῖτε ἡγγικεν γάρ Matt. iv. 17 (= k. syr. vt Justin); he omits Matt. xxi. 44 (= d. 33 lat.vt syr.sin Orig.), and νομικός Matt. xxii. 36 (= 1 e. syr.sin).

One of the most characteristic specimens of Dr. Blass's editing is to be found in Matt. x. 23. Students of the text are aware that there is a various reading in this passage. The so-called 'Western' texts read, with minor variations, ὅταν δὲ διώκουσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην.

<sup>1</sup> **חַיָת מִתְא** is also found in the Peshitta text of Matt. xxii. 23, though Dr. Blass does not quote it. The reading of *S* in ver. 28 is **בְּחַיָת מִתְרָא** (with no equivalent for *οὐδεν*, *sic*): here Dr. Blass, misled by the reading **בְּחַרְתָ** given in the printed edition, emends the Gospel text into *և τգ τְלֵאֵס οὐδεν*.

<sup>2</sup> In the earlier part of this verse Dr. Blass conjectures *λαβον...* ἔξελθεῖν instead of *λαβόνσαι...* ἔξελθον, starting from the singular reading of the minuscule 700, which has *λαβον...* καὶ ἔξελθον.

[*ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀλλῃ διάκωσιν ἵματα φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἀλλην*], but the bracketed words are omitted by most Greek MSS. and do not appear in the 'Textus Receptus.' On turning to see which reading Dr. Blass had adopted we find *ὅταν δὲ διάκωσιν ἵματα, φεύγετε ἐκ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν*. These words are not found in any MS. of the Gospels; they are Dr. Blass's retranslation of Tertullian's *Cum coepirint persecuti uos fugite de ciuitate in ciuitatem* (*De Fuga* 6). If Tertullian really meant this for an exact quotation, which is after all doubtful, I suspect that it was taken not direct from Scripture, but from the mouth of those who in times of persecution found that this was the only sentence of the Gospel that they could keep in their minds (*De Corona* 1). Dr. Blass's emended text gives the required sense of Matt. x 23 in a much neater literary form than what we have been accustomed to read, but few people will consider it to be a successful restoration of the original text of S. Matthew. It might indeed have satisfied the Emperor Anastasius, who according to a well-known passage of Victor's *Chronicon* thought the Holy Gospels ought to be emended as being the work of illiterate evangelists.

In Matt. xvii 27 St. Peter is commanded to go to the sea and cast his net and take the first fish that came up; 'and,' it says, 'when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a shekel (*εἴριστες στατῆρα*).'<sup>1</sup> Dr. Blass will have none of this, but because St. Chrysostom in telling the story omits *ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ*, he omits these words from his text and changes *εἴριστες στατῆρα* into *εἴρησει στατῆρα*, i.e. the fish will fetch a shekel *when sold*. Dr. Blass claims St. Chrysostom as a supporter here also, though St. Chrysostom reads *εἴριστες ἐν αὐτῷ στατῆρα* and then goes on to discourse upon the wonder of the miracle, which (he says) shews Christ's power over the sea as much as when He made Peter walk on the waves.

Moreover he uses such phrases as *ὁ τὸν φόρον τελῶν ἰχθὺς* and *ἀγαγέν τὸν κομιζόντα τὸν στατῆρα*, and remarks how miraculous it was that this particular fish should be caught first. I fear St. Chrysostom gives but a weak support to Dr. Blass's rationalising emendation. It is quite conceivable that the original tradition, now lost, may have represented the Temple tribute to have been defrayed by the sale of St. Peter's fish, but to import this version of the story into the canonical Gospel according to St. Matthew is to play with the evidence.<sup>1</sup>

It is a pity to have to pass so unfavourable a verdict upon a work on which Dr. Blass has evidently spent much labour and ingenuity. But it is a work which illustrates only too well the danger of literary eclecticism in the textual criticism of the New Testament. In Dr. Hort's words, 'investigation of the history and character of documentary ancestries would indeed be out of place for the text of the New Testament if the documentary evidence were so hopelessly chaotic that no difference of authority could carry much weight as between readings all having some clearly ancient attestation.... The summary decisions inspired by an unhesitating instinct as to what an author must needs have written, or dictated by the supposed authority of "canons of criticism" as to what transcribers must needs have introduced, are in reality in a large proportion of cases attempts to dispense with the solution of problems that depend on genealogical data' (Hort, *Introd.* § 373). If Dr. Blass has failed to satisfy, smaller men cannot hope to succeed.

F. C. BURKITT.

<sup>1</sup> A somewhat similar instance is Matt. iv 24, where Dr. Blass changes *ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν* into *ὅλην τὴν συνορίαν* on the authority of Γ, a third-rate uncial of the ninth century. Surely the source of our first Gospel here spoke of *Tyre* and *Sidon* as well as of Galilee and Judaea (Mk. iii 7, 8; Lk. vi 17). In connexion with this reading it may be noted that Dr. Blass brackets *Xαπαναῖα* in Matt. xv 21).

## CORRESPONDENCE.

EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, LL. 1214-5.

'Ἄλλ' ἡνίχ' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτι' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει  
(καπνῷ δ' ἐσῆμηρ' ἄστυ) πολεμίων ὑπὸ<sup>1</sup>  
ξένον κατέκτας.'

MR. A. W. MAIR has missed the point of my (or rather Paley's) statement that line 1215, when printed between commas as a separate sentence, involves 'a singular ellipse.' I suppose that no reader of this *Review* needs to be told that *καπνῷ δ' ἐσῆμηρ'* 'is complete in itself' or, in other words, that *σημαίνω* is used absolutely. I did not think it necessary to point out anything so obvious; nor need Mr. Mair

even go to δηλῶ to find a parallel passage, for this very use of *-σημαίνω* occurs in Thucydides' account of the Plague, as is notorious. The 'singular ellipse' is the ellipse of a participle to give *πολεμίων* ὑπὸ a proper construction (*vide* Paley's note), and to that point, which is the gist of the whole matter, Mr. A. W. Mair should address himself before he can defend the old reading by citing *Agamemnon* 815. Of course Euripides' lines are a reminiscence of Aeschylus (*vide* Paley again), but that has nothing to do with my point.

E. C. MARCHANT.

## REPORTS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—EASTER AND TRINITY TERMS 1901.

ON May 10th Mr. WARDE FOWLER read a paper on 'The fourth Eclogue of Virgil,' in which it was maintained: (1) (in criticism of recent views, e.g. of Prof. W. M. Ramsay and M. Salomon Reinach) that if the last four lines of the poem be duly taken into account, the *parvus puer* of the poem was a real child actually born, and not an abstraction or poetical conception of a new age; (2) that the last four lines have been unduly neglected in the general interpretation of the poem, which is a prophetic *carmen* sung during the actual process of birth; the birth and prophecy are both completed at the end of line 59, and in the remaining four lines the prophetess addresses the new-born infant in the language of an Italian nurse; (3) that the *deus* and *dea* of the last line are the *di coniugales*, Hercules and Juno. This conclusion was suggested by a passage in the Danielian Servius (Thilo and Hagen, vol. III. p. 53, note), in which it is said that there was a custom in noble families at Rome of placing a mensa to Hercules and a lectus to Juno in the atrium on the birth of a child. For the concurrence of Hercules and Juno, see Roscher's *Lexicon s. v. Juno* 581 foll., or Fowler's *Roman Festivals*, p. 142 foll. The reader also expressed an opinion (though considering the question of no importance) that the puer was the expected child of Octavianus and Scribonia.

At the same meeting Mr. GRUNDY read a paper on 'The Attitude of the Delphic Oracle to the War of 480 B.C.' : the contents will appear in his forthcoming work on the *Great Persian War*.

On May 24th Mr. PRICKARD read a paper on 'The month and day of the taking of Troy, with special reference to Aesch. *Agam.* 826.' There is a general agreement among authorities, differing as to the year, that Troy was taken in the early summer

(a day in Thargelior, probably the 23rd or 24th). See *Arundel Marble Epoch* 25, historians quoted by Plutarch (*Life of Camillus*) and by Eusebius *Præp. Evan.* X, 12, Dionysius Halicarn. See also *Aeneid* III. 8. The only authority for an autumn date is Tzetzes, who appears to contradict himself (*Posthomericæ* 700-766).

But nearly all commentators on Aeschylus explain ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύστιν of the autumn (morning) setting of the Pleiads, a date about November 2. They refer back to Stanley, who, in his edition of 1664, has no note on Agam. 826, and on line 40 shows that Troy was taken in the spring, but in a MS. note on 826 printed by Butler, shows reasons for an autumnal date, mainly drawn from Joseph Scaliger 'De emendatione temporum.' Some, as Klausen, add that Aeschylus chose an autumnal date as better suiting the details of the storm, others that he followed an old epic.

Is it impossible that he referred to the spring (evening) setting of the Pleiads, which in Greece, 3,000 years ago, occurred about April 9?

(1) Conventionally, the 'setting of the Pleiads' meant the autumn date (see passages in Hippocrates, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Polybius, Arrian). But this was purely conventional. Hesiod (*W. D.* 384) makes it clear by the sequence of phenomena, which setting he means; Virgil *G. 1*, 221 expressly adds 'eae'; if the setting have any value in the narrative of Aeschylus, and is not a dead note of time, the setting which is most suitable may be understood.

(2) A scholiast on Aratus 261 (p. 392 Maass) after referring to the autumn setting, adds: τήν δὲ ἐσπέριον δύστεως οὐκ ἐμνήσθη, διὰ τὸ συμβαίνειν αὐτὴν περὶ τὴν ἔρωντις ἴσημεριν, καὶ μηδὲν ἐξαρτεῖται περιτέχειν σημεῖον. But the spring setting was noted, for forty

days were reckoned from it to the spring rising (Hesiod *W. D.* 385) : see too Columella XI. 2, 34.

(3) Such a date as April 9 would be too early to agree with the historians. But the taking of Troy, *i.e.* all the events recorded in *Aen.* II., must have been matter of time : the mere sack would have taken a week or a fortnight (see remarks by Napoleon I). The horse may have been ordered to be in readiness for his leap by 'the setting of the Pleiads' : yet the assault and sack not completed for several weeks. Something must be allowed for the stilted antithetical style of Agamemnon's speech. 'The horse leapt (crouched for his leap ?) up, as the Pleiads sank down' (cf. line 819).

The alternative is to suppose that Aeschylus, without any other indication of doing so, followed a tradition which made the Greeks leave Troy at a time of year when storms were naturally to be expected, and the sea was closed. (Hesiod *W. D.*, 618. Theocr. 13, 25. Dem. p. 1214.)

Wecklein (ed. Leipzig, 1888) understands Aeschylus to have referred to the day in early March on which the play was acted, when the Pleiads would have risen at 10 or 11 P.M. As to this see Dr. Verrall's *Appendix P.*

*Choeph.* : 276-290.

Leprosy is here threatened as one of the consequences of disobedience to the order of Apollo. Commentators refer to Exodus 13, 3 for the disease and the seclusion from society. Compare also Herodotus I, 138 ὅτι ἀν δὲ τῶν ἀστῶν λέπρη ἡ λεύκη, ἐς πόλιν οὐτοσοὶ κατέρχεται, οὐδὲ συμβολεῖται τοῦς ἄλλους Πέρσηστοι φασὶ δὲ μή εἰς τὸν ήλιον ἀμφτόντα τι, ταῦτα ξεῖν. This foreign notion may have suggested to Aeschylus leprosy as a penalty appointed by the bright god for an offence against the light, the neglect of a duty enjoined by him.—In line 279 Weil's δελῶν for δὲ νῦν suits this well. The god who expounded modes of expiation also declared the penalties to fall on cowards, sinners against the light.—δελῶν in capitals has nearly the same strokes as δὲ νῦν and preserves the circumflex accent.

*Choeph.* : 712-4.

Most editors change δὲ to τε unwarrantably. 'δὲ distinguishes between Orestes and his companions' Couington.—But this will be clearer if we assume that a line has fallen out after 713, so that the passage ran (with a doggerel line inserted, for illustration) :—

ἀγ' αὐτὸν εἰς ἀνθρώπας εἰδένους δόμων,  
οὐποθέπους δὲ τούσδε καὶ ἔννεμπόρους  
<εἰς πανδοκείον πέμπε μέτρην πρότω>  
κάκει κυρούντων δώμασιν τὰ πρόσφορα.

The assumption is reasonable, as all three lines are omitted in M, (and in G), and crowded into the margin of M.

That Orestes had attendants, besides Pylades, is probable from Soph. *El.* 1123, Eur. *El.* 821, see also Ar. *Birds* 650-7. In this play he appears to be admitted alone into the palace (866-7), though he is joined by Pylades at the supreme moment (899).

At the same meeting Mr. A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE read some botanical notes on Virgil's *Elegies* and *Georgics*, and a note upon the agricultural operations of the 1st *Georgic*. He discussed the meanings of *ligustrum*, *vaccinium* and *hibiscus*, and suggested some slight changes of punctuation and interpretation in *Georgic* I, with a view to making clear the sequence of operations which were in the poet's mind when he wrote.

On June 7th, Prof. COOK WILSON read a paper on 'ἐπάγειν in Aristotle,' of which the following are the main points :

(i) ἐπάγειν meant to lead a person to see or admit something, and had for its grammatical object the person persuaded and not a logical conclusion. The logical idiom in the case of ἐπάγειν and cognate words arose from the phrases proper to the debate between two persons one of whom is ἐπάγων and the other is ἐπαγόμενος,—a distinctive parallel to that between ἐρωτῶν and ἐρωτάμενος. This accounts for the passive (ἐπαχθῆναι, etc.) and even the expression ἐπάγειν τὸ καθόλου corresponds to ἐρωτᾶν τὸ καθόλου, the direct object of the verb in both cases being the person debated with, and the full phrase with the personal object supplied is actually found in Alexander Comm. in Top. 518. 8 δὲ ἀν δὲ ἐρωτῶν ἐπάγοιτο τὸν ἀποκρινόμενον τὴν καθόλου πρότασιν αὐτῷ τιθέναι.

(ii) The idea of leading a person up to something, included beside inductive argumentation, other meanings rare in Aristotle, of which there are traces in other writers, and these seem to explain some difficult passages in Aristotle, viz. (1) the alluring of a person to a fallacy, Topics 111b 32. (Passages from Aulus Gellius, quoting from Cicero's time, and from Diogenes Laertius were cited) : (2) the introducing of a person to a new experience (or a new subject), a sense of ἐπάγειν (and seemingly the only sense) found in Aristoxenus, which occurs also in Plato; and probably explains Arist. Post. An. 71a 21 and Prior. An. 67a 23.

The paper, which was too long to be read in full, contained a discussion of all the passages in Aristotle, which the writer could find, in which ἐπάγειν or any cognate word occurs.

LEWIS R. FARRELL.  
*Hon. Sec.*

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### THE DATE OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PROPYLAEA.

M. COLLIGNON in discussing a *Relation* which he publishes in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, IV. Série, 25, 1897, says, on page 69 : 'On a vu que la date de la relation se place entre les années 1674 et 1685. Elle serait fixée à coup sûr si nous connaissions avec certitude l'année où

les Propylées sautèrent. Cet événement, dit l'auteur anonyme, eut lieu "faict 35 ans." Spon et Wheler qui écrivent en 1676, le place "vingt ans plus tôt" c'est-à-dire en 1656. \* \* \* \* \* Spon commet-il une erreur de date? Est-ce l'Anonyme [the author of the *Relation*] qui est mal renseigné? Il est difficile de se prononcer.' M. Collignon does not mention the other evidence bearing upon this point and it may

perhaps be of some interest to call attention to it.

Spon's account (*Voyage*, II. pp. 140 f., Lyons edition of 1678) is to the effect that twenty years before the time he was writing, that is in 1656, there was powder in the Propylaea, and that the Aga, Isouf, was planning to knock down with cannon a little church, St. Demetrius, situated at the foot of the Museum hill, there being a Turkish feast at the time. A flash of lightning, however, on the previous night spoiled this plan by exploding the powder in the Propylaea and destroying the building together with the Aga and all of his family, one daughter alone excepted.

In the *Relazione* of de la Rue (published in the *Archäologische Zeitung* for 1878) the date 1645 is given for the explosion, and the story told is essentially the same that Spon gives. There are, however, a few variations of detail. The Greeks, de la Rue says, were celebrating the feast of St. Demetrius, and the Aga proposed to explode some bombs on them in the Church. The first one did little harm, so it was planned to arrange a battery of three pieces and to destroy the church entirely. But the thunder-bolt interfered. The name of the church is given as: "Άγιος Δημήτριος Λουρπαρδάρης = Santo Demetrio il Bombardiere. (See A. Mommsen, *Athenae Christianae*, p. 52.)

The earlier date for the destruction of the building is supported also by the diary of a Hanoverian officer (published in the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, 1887, pp. 368 ff.). This officer writes during the Venetian siege (1687) and says that the explosion took place *about* forty years before.

We have therefore three sources, the *Relation* published by Collignon, de la Rue's *Relazione* and the Hanoverian officer's diary, which give an earlier date than Spon does for this catastrophe. It is quite likely therefore that the latter has made a slight error.

J. R. WHEELER.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,  
NEW YORK.

#### SOULS IN THE AETHER AND SOPHOCLES, *AJAX* 1192 f.

*Aj.* 1192 ὄφελε πρότερον αἰθέρα δύναι μέγαν ἡ  
τὸν πολύκονον Ἀΐδαν  
κείνος ἀνήρ, ὃς στυγερῶν ἔδειξεν  
ὅπλων  
Ἐλλασι κοινὸν Ἄρη.

This passage is usually explained by a reference to *Trach.* 953:

εἴθ' ἀνεμόεσσι τις  
γένοιτ' ἔπουρος ἐστιώτις αἴρα,  
ἥτις μ' ἀποκίστειν ἐκ τόπων κ.τ.λ.

and to a passage in the *Philoctetes* (1092 f.), in which, however, the text is probably corrupt. The latter passages reproduce a familiar thought in Homer, as, for instance, when Penelope wishes to be snatched up by a storm wind—like the daughters of Pandaros—and dropped by the outlet of the river Okeanos.<sup>1</sup> Here the thought is that the person himself is snatched away as by a whirlwind and left to die.

In the passage from the *Ajax* there is no reference to any storm wind, and the second member of the expression rather suggests that the aether is thought of as an abode of souls, corresponding to Hades. In a series of passages in Euripides the aether is regarded as an abode of souls, or of both gods and souls.<sup>2</sup> The same thought comes out in the inscription over the dead who fell at Potidaia b.c. 429.<sup>3</sup> To us the thought that souls go to heaven to be with the gods, while the body is buried, is familiar enough; and in the Platonic theology it finds an appropriate place. But for earlier Greek belief death and the souls of the dead belong to a world which is the very antithesis of the world of the gods. The theological idea of Euripides (souls akin to the gods) and the corresponding philosophical idea (the soul of the same nature as the gods) are entirely out of line, first, with the theology which we learn from Homer, and, secondly, with the religious practice of Greek shrines.

Some light may be thrown on the passage in Sophocles by considering the two methods of burial prevalent in Greece. Burial in the earth, evidently the older method, gave rise to the Greek belief in an abode of souls beneath the earth, a realm of Hades. But in Homer the bodies of the dead are cremated, and although the soul still 'goes to Hades' it no longer has any local association with one spot in the earth. A people which regularly burned its dead would never think of placing the abode of souls beneath the earth. As the body of the dead man was consumed in the flames, the dead man himself would be thought of as

<sup>1</sup> v 63 f. Cf. Z 345 f., a 241 f., § 371.

<sup>2</sup> Eur. *Hel.* 1219; *Frag.* 971; *eis* ἀδάνατον αἰθέρ' ἐμπειρῶν *Hel.* 1016; αἰθήρ ξεινοῖς ηδη κ.τ.λ. *Suppl.* 1140

<sup>3</sup> C. I. A. I. 442 αἰθήρ μὲν ψυχὰς ὑπεδέξατο, σέ[ματα] δὲ χθῶν] | τῶνδε . . .

going up in the smoke, and the abode of the dead would be in the heavens—perhaps among the stars as some tribes of North American Indians believe.

It is a suggestion of this thought which I find in this passage in Sophokles. The chorus are not saying literally 'Would that the man who began war had been buried or burned,' but they pray 'Would that he had died, and that his soul had gone to the abode of souls, be that above or below.' The conception of Hades was so firmly rooted in Greek myth and poetry, that the idea of an abode of souls in the heavens finds little or no expression before the passage we are considering. The importance of this passage, then, is that it does suggest a popular belief in an abode of souls such as would naturally arise in connection with cremation. When once the dead were thought to 'plunge into the high heavens,' we only need a little logic of rather a primitive character to say that they go to the abode of the gods. Other considerations combine with this to suggest that there is a likeness of nature between the human spirit and the divine spirit, and we reach the doctrine which finds expression in Epicharmos, Euripides, and Plato. That there were other more important factors at work in this process beside the popular belief suggested by Sophokles, no one could deny. My only contention is that the popular belief in an abode of souls in the heavens helped to pave the way for the final form of Greek belief as to the future life.

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.  
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY.

---

ENGELMANN'S ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
STUDIES ON THE TRAGEDIANS.

*Archäologische Studien zu den Tragikern*, von  
RICHARD ENGELMANN, mit 28 Abbildungen.  
Berlin, 1900. 6 Mark.

THE main part of these studies consists of an investigation of the relation of extant representations of certain Greek myths upon vases or other works of art to the plays of

Sophocles and Euripides that dealt with the same subjects—the Έλένης ἀπαύγρωσις, Lao-coon, Σκύριοι, and Tyro of the former, and the Alcmene, Andromeda, Meleager, and Stheneboea of the latter. Some of the scenes on the vases are evidently derived from dramatic representations; in other cases they only illustrate the form of the myth current at Athens in the fifth century. The author's interpretations are probable, and the inferences he derives from them reasonable; so that his work will rank as a serious contribution to the recovery of the plot of the lost tragedies.

In another matter, on which he touches incidentally, his suggestions are more open to dispute. He thinks that the columns which form the background of some scenes, and which are sometimes made use of, e.g. to bind Andromeda to, are reminiscences of the columns of the proscenium, and that when posts or trees occur in a similar position, they may have been, at the performance of the play, fixed in the sockets provided for the temporary wooden proscenium. It would follow that the place of the actors was before the proscenium, as Professor Dörpfeld maintains, not above it; and those who accept Professor Dörpfeld's theory will doubtless welcome Dr. Engelmann's suggestions on this matter. They do not, however, really supply any cogent arguments. Columns, as a background, are common on vases of all periods, to indicate the presence of a house or temple; and, even if a stage setting is in the mind of the painter, columns occur as part of the scene as well as in the proscenium. It will hardly occur to anyone accustomed to the conventions of vase-painting to suggest that the size of the columns represented, in relation to the figures, implies that the painter intended to indicate dwarf columns, such as those of the proscenium. And, as to the binding of Andromeda to columns, we find Prometheus and Odysseus bound to columns instead of to a rock or to the mast of a ship on black figured vases, where no influence of dramatic representations is possible.

E. A. GARDNER.